

Copyright is owned by the Author of the research report. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The research report may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

# **Maori in Governance: The Voices of Maori Trustees**

A report presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

## **Master of Educational Administration**

**Martin Turner**

**January 2006**

MASSEY UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



1061790241



# **Maori in Governance: The Voices of Maori Trustees**

A report presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

## **Master of Educational Administration**

**Martin Turner**

**January 2006**



Candidate’s Statement

I certify that this report, submitted as part of the degree of Master of Educational Administration entitled **Maori in School Governance: The Voices of Maori Trustees** is the result of my own work except where otherwise acknowledged, and has not been submitted, in part or in full, for any other papers or degrees for which credit or qualifications have been granted.

Signed..........  
(Martin Turner)

Date: January 2006



**Abstract**

While the education reforms of 1989 promised much for Maori in education, Maori membership on Boards of Trustees continues to be disproportionately low against that of non-Maori members. The governance role is significant in influencing the provision and outcomes of education for Maori students, but there has been little research into the experiences of Maori in school governance, or the factors that impact on successful partnerships between Maori and Pakeha on school boards.

This research project presents the governance stories of six Maori trustees from different mainstream primary schools. With reference to the Treaty of Waitangi, it explores Maori and Pakeha conceptions of partnership, and discusses the effectiveness of the education reforms in promoting and sustaining partnership with Maori at school governance level.

Through interviews conducted as part of this research, Maori trustees’ understandings of their role in governance, the board’s obligations to the Treaty of Waitangi, and the expectations placed on them as Maori by the board, and by their own Maori community, are explored.

This project highlights some of the complex issues Maori trustees face within a governance structure which is incongruous with traditional Maori principles of collectivism, and illuminates the duality of role many Maori negotiate as school trustees.





## Acknowledgements

I wish to thank the trustees who gave up their time to be part of this research. Their willingness to become involved in research on such a sensitive topic, and their openness and trust in voicing their stories to me has been a humbling, yet mana-enhancing experience for myself as a researcher. Without their rich and personal stories I would not have been able to achieve my aim to further understand and provide insight into the experiences of Maori in school governance.

My sincere thanks to my supervisor Dr. Marian Court who motivated me when my thinking on the research was at an undeveloped stage, and who replied to my every question, encouraging me through difficult times with ethics approval, giving me wise counsel from her vast experience.

I acknowledge my whanau, my colleagues in the Te Reo Maori facilitation team at TEAM Solutions who continue to inspire my interest in ‘things Maori’ and encourage me in my efforts to learn Te Reo.

Finally I wish to acknowledge my family, who have quietly supported me through this project, putting up with my absenteeism while the research was completed.

Naku noa ki a koutou.

Martin Turner



## **Table of contents**

<b>Candidate's Statement</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>v</b>
 <b>CHAPTERS</b>	
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
 <b>2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	 <b>3</b>
2.1 Introduction	3
2.2 Background to the reforms	3
2.3 The inefficiencies in the existing system	4
2.4 The influence of New Right market ideology	4
2.5 Equity and social justice issues	5
2.6 Establishing the taskforce	6
2.7 The changes	7
2.8 The Treaty of Waitangi, partnership and governance	9
2.9 Maori perspectives of the governance model	15
2.10 Summary	17
 <b>3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES</b>	 <b>19</b>
3.1 Why qualitative research?	19
3.2 An exploratory case study approach	22
3.3 Ethical considerations	24
3.4 Selecting, contacting and gaining participant consent	26
3.5 Interviewing	27
3.6 Transcribing	28
3.7 Analysis	29

3.8	Summary	30
<b>4.0</b>	<b>FINDINGS: THE VOICES OF MAORI TRUSTEES</b>	<b>32</b>
4.1	Introducing the participants	32
4.2	Pathways to trusteeship	33
4.3	Wearing two hats	35
4.4	The Treaty and trustee voices about partnership	52
<b>5.0</b>	<b>CONCLUSION</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>71</b>
 <b>Appendices</b>		
	Appendix A: Evidence of consultation	78
	Appendix B: Request for information	79
	Appendix C: Participant consent form	81
	Appendix D: Information sheet	82
	Appendix E: Interview schedule	85
	Appendix F: Authority for the release of tape transcripts	86

## CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

This research project focuses on what the *Tomorrow's Schools* (1988) government reforms intended for Maori involvement in advancing the educational achievement of Maori students. It examines how well the obligations school boards have to the Treaty of Waitangi are met, understood and embraced by investigating what Maori trustees' experiences of the 'partnership' in education looks like sixteen years on. This is exemplified through the eyes of a selection of Maori trustees who discuss their experiences of trusteeship.

The education reforms of 1989 considered parents to be 'partners' with government and not government agents. The reforms itemised in *Tomorrow's Schools* (1988) were not initially set up as a form of decentralisation to simply shift administrative work and responsibilities onto parents, rather it was proposed that schools and communities would have more power over decision-making processes, which in turn would enable them to develop into learning organisations.

The task of increasing Maori community participation in governance (and schooling in general) is a difficult and complex one, particularly when research shows that there has been a marked decline in all forms of parental community involvement post the reforms, between 1990 and 1999 (Wylie, 1999). Coupled with this overall decline, Alton-Lee's *Best Evidence Synthesis* (2003) about what constitutes sound teaching and learning clearly shows that strong home/community and school relationships are of particular importance for children whose culture, and/or ethnicity and cultural heritages are different from the practices of the school. Indeed, educational policy in New Zealand is based on the understanding that increased Maori community involvement and authority in education and the development of cultural continuities between the community and school are important to positive educational outcomes for Maori children (Te Puni Kokiri 2001, Ministry of Education, 2003). It is these families and communities however, for whom there exists a pattern of least involvement (Ministry of Education, 2003).

This research project probes concepts of school governance in relation to partnership, with Maori in particular, and examines the appropriateness or otherwise of the *Tomorrow's Schools* (1988) model of governance where Maori are concerned.

Historically in the case of bicultural research in New Zealand, the prevailing approach of researchers was that research was not primarily about benefiting Maori but instead about explaining Maori behaviours and circumstances for a non-Maori audience (Durie, 2001:5). Maori centred research on the other hand, 'seeks to create opportunities for positive change in Maori communities, drawing on concepts, values and attitudes that arise from Maori thought and world views' (Durie, 2002:7). The plethora of anecdotal 'Maori behaviours and circumstances' (ibid) which have been used by principals, teachers and board members I have worked with over my years as an Adviser and a Principal, to explain why Maori have not been involved as partners in school governance, have not yet been adequately tested. Therefore, this research uses elements of 'Maori-centred' (ibid) methods to investigate related issues from a Maori perspective, exploring it through the eyes of Maori trustees. While a primary aim is to produce a report that may be of benefit to Maori, it may also be useful to those involved in school governance from boards of trustees themselves to Ministry of Education personnel.

The following literature review in chapter two discusses the education reforms of the late 1980s, and looks at the governance model which resulted from those reforms. Concepts about partnership are discussed, along with the Treaty of Waitangi, and Maori perspectives on partnership, governance and representation of whanau.

Chapter three describes the research rationale, design and methods, while chapter four looks at the findings through the eyes of Maori trustees and discusses aspects of these in relation to the literature. Finally chapter five concludes with an exploration of themes around partnership within a governance framework, and the continuing issues that may confront Maori trustees serving on school boards.

## **CHAPTER TWO:**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

The literature review begins with a background to the education reforms of 1989, *Tomorrow's Schools* (1988) that created the Board of Trustees governance structure, focussing on New Zealand research, and making links to the intended outcomes for Maori.

The second section looks at the Treaty of Waitangi explaining the concept of self-determination as it relates to the treaty, and governance as it relates to the present model used in education where boards of trustees have a school self-management role.

#### **2.2 Background to the reforms**

The reforms to education administration, known as *Tomorrow's Schools* (1988) led to the creation of radical new structures in a system largely unchanged for decades. The reforms abolished the Department of Education, the regional Education Boards, all school committees and Boards of Governors and replaced these with a streamlined Ministry of Education and individual Boards of Trustees for each school.

The idea of community involvement in education is not new, and the suggestion that schools be administered at local level rather than by central control can be traced back over a period of time, as shown by the statement Charles Bowen made in the House of Representatives when introducing the 1877 Education Bill:

The Bill we intend to submit to this house provides entirely for local administration, subject to ultimate central control in some matters, especially in matters of expenditure...the Government is perfectly satisfied that the general administration of the schools must be left in the hands of Local Boards: for without such local administration it would be impossible to keep up the public interest which is necessary in an education system.  
(cited in Butterworth and Butterworth, 1998:9)



The three main factors that led to changes were the reformers' arguments about inefficiencies in the existing system (Picot, 1988:29), the influence of New Right market ideology (Codd, 1990), and the equity and social justice issues that were gaining attention, especially the need for education to be more appropriate for Maori (Smith 1999, Codd, 1993).

### **2.3 The inefficiencies in the existing system**

While in 1877 Charles Bowen spoke of the need for local management, this intention was gradually lost and a very centrally controlled system of decision-making developed. This system comprised a number of layers between the government and the individual school, including the Department of Education, at national and regional level, the Education Boards and the individual school committees.

The problems that existed in the current system were clearly identified by the Taskforce to Review Education Administration. They noted:

There is an overly high degree of centralisation in our education system... Very few decisions are made at local level: when they are, they are heavily influenced by rules and procedures determined centrally. It is not uncommon for minor personnel matters such as an individual's leave or reimbursement of expenses to be referred to the head office of the department for a judgement. When such matters have already been considered by an employing body and probably also by a regional office the result is frustration and delay – and a wasteful duplication of time and resources (1988:22).

Tales of the frustrations and delays in decision making abounded (Harold, 1995) and the Education Boards were seen as operating with a culture of form filling and officialdom.

### **2.4 The influence of New Right market ideology**

The reforms in the New Zealand education administration were part of a comprehensive set of reforms across the social sectors carried out by the fourth Labour Government (1984-1990) and were strongly influenced by what Olssen & Morris Matthews (1997) call a New Right ideology of an economic and social culture 'based on enterprise and self reliance' (1997:31). The basic premise of New Right

ideology emphasised individual parental choice about the education of their children and limited the state's role to areas such as the defence of individual liberties and property rights. Hayek (1973, cited in Snook, 1997) saw the role of democratic government as protecting the market and the values that accompanied it.

In New Zealand the New Right theories promoted by Treasury and other groups such as the Business Round Table saw education in economic terms as a means to providing trained human resources to improve the competitive positioning of New Zealand in a global market, and as a commodity to be chosen and 'consumed' by individuals (Middleton, Codd & Jones, 1990). The 1987 Treasury publication, *Government Management: Brief to the In-coming Government Vol II: Education Issues*, challenged the widely held belief that education is a public good and proposed that education shared the main characteristics of other commodities in the marketplace and could therefore be considered a private good:

Formal education is unavoidably part of the market economy and the Government can afford to be no less concerned with the effectiveness and profitability of its expenditure on education in relation to the state's aims, than any private provider would be in relation to their own aims (Treasury, 1987:271).

The extent of the New Right influence in the New Zealand education reforms, particularly the influence and involvement of the Treasury, has been debated extensively (Butterworth and Butterworth, 1998; Fitzsimons, Peters and Roberts, 1999; Rae, 1999) but it was undoubtedly a major factor in shaping the reforms. In arguing for a shift from a centralised bureaucracy to a market environment for schools the New Right reformers espoused 'public choice theory' and 'New Public Management' (Boston 1991, cited in Codd, 1998:2) as a catalyst for the concept of governance and trusteeship under which New Zealand schools now operate.

## **2.5 Equity and social justice issues**

The existing system contained many anomalies, and decisions on the allocation of resources such as building improvements were not necessarily made on an evidence basis, and lacked transparency. According to Butterworth and Butterworth (1998) the Cabinet was very keen to see a transparent system of administration where equity

issues could be addressed also by the provision of increased or targeted resources. More importantly, in terms of this study's concerns, the academic performance of Maori and Pasifika students was causing concern. This was particularly evident in external examination results where Maori and Pasifika students were disproportionately represented in the failing group (Butterworth and Butterworth, 1998). Some Maori parents felt that the existing school structure did not meet their childrens' needs and were keen to see a more flexible system. For example, flexibility was needed to address issues resulting from the expansion of kohanga reo (the Maori early childhood language 'nests') into the primary school sector and the development of Kura Kaupapa Maori. However, while on the surface the reforms promised much in terms of addressing social justice and equity issues, opponents like Codd (1993) argued that 'under the influence of market liberalism', school leaders and their boards would inevitably be 'forced to surrender their traditional commitment to social justice in order to pursue the goals of competition and increased individual choice' (1993:157).

In summary then, the issues that influenced the need to reform represented both ends of the political spectrum and the 1987 Labour Government was faced with the competing influences of the right wing market approach and the left wing social justice concerns as it planned the reforms.

## **2.6 Establishing the taskforce to review education administration**

In order to begin the change process, the 1987 Labour Government established the Taskforce to Review Education Administration (henceforth referred to as the Taskforce) on 21 July 1987. Brian Picot, a successful businessman and company director, led the Taskforce and members included a second businessman, two educationalists and a social researcher with the Department of Maori Affairs. The Taskforce's summation of the existing education system was scathing: 'the structure is a creaky cumbersome affair' (Taskforce to Review Education Administration, 1988:ix). The weaknesses identified within the existing system including overcentralisation of decision making, complexity, lack of information and choice, lack of effective management practices, and feelings of powerlessness (1988:22) were

about to be addressed, the Taskforce deciding that “tinkering with the system” (1988:36) would not be sufficient to produce the degree of change necessary. Radical reform was proposed.

**2.7 The changes**

The Taskforce released its report *Administering for Excellence* (Taskforce to Review Education Administration, 1988) (henceforth referred to as the Picot Report) in April 1988. The new structure proposed in the Picot Report had features that emphasized structural simplicity and local decision-making. There should be national objectives and clear responsibilities and goals. Decision-makers should have control over the available resources and be accountable for what was achieved, and the whole structure should be responsive to client needs and open to public scrutiny. With particular relevance to this study, the Picot Report (1988) spoke of learning institutions being a partnership between the professionals and the community, and the mechanism for this being the board of trustees (1988:ix). The Taskforce proposed that each board of trustees consist of five elected parent representatives, the principal and an elected staff representative. There was also provision for boards to co-opt a further four members to the Board to ensure that the board had a range of skills and a fair representation of the parent community. The composition of Boards was designed to ensure that the powers of decision-making lay firmly with the parents of the school, as parent-elected members would always have the majority vote (*Tomorrow’s Schools* 1988).

The concept of ‘partnership’ is an important element for the success of the education reforms – that is the partnership between the school and its local community, and the partnership between the school and the state. The establishment of boards of trustees was seen to be a fundamental step towards these partnerships because the board of trustees was to act both as the link between the community and school and as the agent of the school in its relationship with the crown. In this model, the devolution of power was politically inspired rather than administrative (Education Review Office, 1999a) because a substantial amount of power shifted from central government to local communities through the establishment of individual Boards of Trustees for

each school. However, power over finance and curriculum remained centrally controlled and some commentators who take a cynical view (Codd, 1993, and Smith, 1996) contend that the subliminal agenda of the reforms was to create what Ball (1994) termed the ‘illusion of increased freedom and choice’ (1994:81) for parents in the education of their children. Wylie (1995) suggests that the ‘New Public Management’ model may well have been ‘closer to the heart’ of the education reforms than the focus espoused by government through Education Review Office rhetoric of the time (1995:153). While not completely dismissive of the honourable intentions of the education reforms, Wylie suggests that that they did not take into account the employment, ethnicity and class issues that schools faced, and that only a small gain might be made at the greater cost of ‘forgone attention to teaching and learning, within positive supportive relationships’ that had hitherto existed in New Zealand schools (1995:163).

Smelt (1998) summarised the reforms under four major headings; increased choice for parents between schools; devolution of power to individual school level; increased voice for parents through the Board of Trustees and also through the ability to leave the school or create a school within a school; and a move to a contractual relationship between schools, the government and the community. The promises of an increased ‘voice and choice’ for parents is particularly significant for this study as some authors on the subject (Johnston, 1991, Graham, 2002, Codd, 1990) contend that this has not been the result for Maori parents.

Most of the Taskforce recommendations were adopted and promulgated in the policy document *Tomorrow's Schools* (1988), with the exception of The ‘Community Education Forums’ and the ‘Parent Advocacy Council’, which were abolished by the in-coming National government in 1991 before they had a chance to become fully established. The ‘Parent Advocacy Council’ and the ‘Community Education Forums’ were planned initiatives which may well have been beneficial to Maori, but these avenues to redress power relations in education were closed off before coming to fruition in what Gordon (1994) suggests was a deliberate strategy to take away voice and replace with choice – choice in this case being parents’ right to ‘exit’ from a

school for whatever reason (1994:11), the subtext being the maintenance of state control over schools.

These reforms initially promised much for Maori people, in particular through new opportunities available to Maori through representation on Boards of trustees, and participation in ‘charter’ development which would set community direction for the school. The Picot Taskforce had high hopes for just such a result:

We are convinced that this change, together with the others we have recommended, will result in an education system within which Maori have considerably more scope to exercise a fair measure of influence over their children’s education (Taskforce to Review Education Administration, 1988:29).

The provision for Maori partnership relationships was for community and family involvement and participation through individual representation on School Boards of Trustees. Section 3.2.2 of *Tomorrow’s Schools* (1988) states:

The whanau will have access to and participate in education. This will be possible through individuals within the whanau being eligible for election to the Board of Trustees, and also through the close partnership envisaged between the community and the institutions... (1988:26).

But, Patricia Johnson (cited in Olssen & Matthews, 1997) claimed that the reforms did precisely the opposite of this reinforcing and intensifying the structural inequalities that already exist between Maori and Pakeha, and that overall, Maori had not been empowered, having their ‘values ignored and their collective interests reduced to an aggregation of individual choices’ (1997:33). This claim is explored further in the findings section of the study where it is reconciled to interviewee’s comments.

## **2.8 The Treaty of Waitangi, partnership and governance.**

In recent times, there has been much political rhetoric around the Treaty of Waitangi. David Lange (*Tomorrow’s Schools*, 1988) hailed the Treaty as significant in education policy making for Maori. However, Maori might argue that in terms of educational outcomes for Maori students, the spirit and intent of the Treaty of

Waitangi has not been manifested in the educational achievements of Maori students to date.

Article Two of the Treaty of Waitangi signed in 1840 made guarantees to Maori that tino Rangatiratanga, or 'self-determination', over Maori taonga, or 'treasures' would be protected. As well, Maori would be able to define for themselves what constituted taonga, and would be given power to protect and promote taonga accordingly. Maori may well have believed that their language as a valued taonga would be given status and be advanced through this new de-centralised system of localised school governance.

The right to self-determination through a partnership between Maori and Pakeha (through the crown) is a strong theme that emerges from the Treaty of Waitangi. Its implications for education, have been a feature of the *Tomorrow's Schools* (1988) reforms since their inception. For example, references to the Treaty of Waitangi in the Picot Report stated that: 'The provisions of the Treaty of Waitangi will be observed... Maori people have a special status under the Treaty of Waitangi' (1988:3-4). These sentiments were also manifested in the 1989 Education Act as affirmative policy for Maori. Section 62 of the Education Act requires School Boards of Trustees of any given school to properly consider the views and concerns of its Maori community when it prepares or amends its charter.

The Treaty of Waitangi was one of the non-discretionary segments of school charters meaning it was a compulsory component of the school charter. Charters contained a pre written framework that provided the goals and objectives for the Treaty of Waitangi. Boards were to ensure that they considered Maori viewpoints and aspirations regarding the education of their children, but what has evolved over fifteen plus years of *Tomorrow's Schools* (1988) has not borne this original intention out as will be shown later. Educational reforms continued into the 1990s. The rhetoric around the Treaty was still being emphasised by government several years on. For example, in a publication summarising school reviews in 1994, the Education Review Office commented on effective schools that high expectations for Maori children or a commitment to fulfil the intent of the Treaty of Waitangi were also evident in the

schools studied (1994:21). By 1993 the Government had moved away from the previous, rather cumbersome and prescriptive statements required in early Charters and replaced them with the National Education Guidelines. The purpose of these guidelines was to clarify the role of Boards of Trustees in relation to their obligations in their governance role (Leadership and Management facilitation team, 2004:6)

The National Education Guidelines contain ten statements of desirable achievement that Boards of Trustees must work towards, in partnership with Government. Within these guidelines are more prescriptive administrative guidelines which require boards to consult with Maori about their aspirations for the education of their children, and then document and action resultant plans. Reference is made to New Zealand's 'dual heritage', with schools providing opportunity for all students to receive education in the Maori language medium if desired by parents, and the valuing of Maori culture and language in recognition of New Zealand's cultural diversity (NEG number 10, *ibid*:10). The spirit and intent of the 'NEGs' implicitly mandated a partnership paradigm (Graham, 2002). However in terms of promoting greater involvement and participation of Maori in schooling, the Guidelines made no specific statements. While Section 62 of the 1989 Education Act required boards to consult their Maori communities, the ambiguity of the requirement allowed for different types of consultation, both minimal and nominal (Johnston, 1991), and the inadequacy of acceptable guidelines for Maori partnership relationships thus resulted in an inconsistent level of school consultation with Maori (Graham, 2002).

The Treaty and its relevance and importance to school boards in their governance role remains controversial. The goal statement is very broad and does not consider past histories (Simon, 1986, 1990; Smith 1988) and the charter does not make allowances for the unequal power relations that are prevalent between Maori and Pakeha in decision-making forums like school Boards of Trustees (Johnston 1991, Graham 2002, Smith, 1999). Bishop and Glynn (1999) suggest that the Treaty of Waitangi has done nothing to further Maori educational aspirations. With the plethora of critique about the Treaty and education available, it is difficult to see how it could ever have been envisaged as being a catalyst for educational equity for Maori. As Bishop and Glynn state:



The development of New Zealand since the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, despite continual armed and passive resistance by Maori people, has been one where the Pakeha majority has benefited enormously and where Maori have been politically marginalised, culturally and racially attacked, and economically impoverished within their own country. These claims hold true in education as they do in all areas of economic and social policy (1999:15).

The foundation for these inequalities can be understood as follows. The signing of the Treaty of Waitangi brought together two distinctly different cultures. It brought together a European culture which ‘functioned on individual property rights and particularly abstract political, social and economic institutions’ and a Maori culture which ‘centred on collective property rights and institutions structured on whakapapa, which nurtured Maori values, kinship bonds and an affinity to nature and the universe (Stokes, 2003:27).

Stokes indicates here why Maori might have difficulty adapting to a system of governance which was foreign to their cultural value base and traditional social structures. In reality, Pakeha governance is not a Maori kaupapa.

However, the *Tomorrow's Schools* (1988) reforms recommended partnership relationships in education between Maori and Pakeha, based upon the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. All legislative amendments, reviews and remodelling of the education system of the time ensured that the Treaty was acknowledged as an important step towards biculturalism. For example the Royal Commission on Social Policy made links between the Treaty of Waitangi and the concepts of ‘partnership’ and ‘equality’ arguing that partnership as a commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi is a key aspect of developing and maintaining relationships with Maori communities and that the Treaty of Waitangi is about two peoples entering into an agreement as equal partners (1988). But Maori and Pakeha had differing views on what biculturalism was, and therefore interpretations of partnership have remained polarised. Johnston (1993) describes this thinking as a ‘misconception’ that encompasses the notion that the introduction of Maori language and culture through the Treaty of Waitangi in the non-negotiable section of charters, guarantees that Maori interests will be met. According to her, references to the Treaty of Waitangi such as in the 1987 Curriculum Review, in the 1988 Picot Report, and in the charters, are ‘insipid weak’ accounts that

lack promise and any form of specificity (Johnston, 1993, cited in Graham, 2002:66). Similar critiques comes from Graham (2002) himself where he states that ‘the charter does not make allowances for the unequal power relations that are prevalent between Maori and Pakeha in decision-making forums like School Boards of Trustees’ (2002:66).

The concept of partnership in governance in reference to the Treaty of Waitangi, is extrapolated more recently in the Ministry of Education publication ‘Better Relationships for Better Learning’ (2000) as being able to ‘occur at all levels of policy making by the sharing of power and decision making, satisfactory methods of consultation, and the inclusion of cultural perspectives in school policies’ (2000:7). The Ministry advocates that a key feature for school governors to internalise is that partnership be ensured through representation at all levels of administration.

Statements such as the above emphasise how little progress has been made under *Tomorrow’s Schools* (1988) in achieving improved education outcomes for Maori students. Maori representation at governance level is still limited (New Zealand School Trustees Association) and Maori students are still under-represented in achievement figures (Te Puna Kokiri 2003). *Maori Participation and Performance – A Summary* (Else, 1997) argues Maori are still failing the education system because of a focus on deficit. The deficit focus is based on Pakeha notions of ‘what is to count as knowledge’ where the dominant group’s culture and language are elevated to a position of normality (Kenrick, 2002), and thus a position of superiority (Johnston, 1998, Woodward, 1997, cited in Graham, 2002).

In a report on schools that are making a difference for the educational outcomes of Maori students, an Education Review Office report (2002) cites NZCER research that states that ‘There is considerable evidence indicating that involvement of (Maori) parents in their children’s education is a major factor in the children’s future academic success’. However while most of the schools in this study make an effort to get their Maori parents more involved it is acknowledged that ‘possibly due to negative experiences when they were at school, Maori parents are generally less likely to become involved in their children’s education than Pakeha’ (McKinley, 2000:12).

This is affirmed by Wylie (1999) who highlights New Zealand research which shows that teacher effectiveness with children from non-dominant cultures and ethnicities is limited if there are low levels of teacher- parental/community contact. While partnership and collaboration through increased Maori participation in school governance may assist in better educational outcomes for Maori students it may not necessarily be guaranteed due to the unequal power relations previously mentioned.

Ramsey, Hawk, Harold, Marriot & Poskitt (1993), Sergiovanni (1996), all contend that collaboration between parents and school is central to forging effective partnerships, lifting both teachers and students to higher levels of self-understanding, commitment and performance. In other words, the more that parents are involved in educational activities the more likely they are to understand educational processes, and that parental involvement in schooling will somehow improve partnerships and collaboration between parents and school, and that this will positively filter down to the attitudes and commitments of students.

In critique however, comes a contrary view to the partnership discourse from Carol Vincent (2000) who writes about educational reform and schooling improvement literature within a British context. She suggests that while ‘partnership’ on the surface conveys a sense of equality of relationship, it is clear that partnerships are articulated and progressed in education in very different ways. Vincent argues that ‘partnerships’ have worked much more to position parents and communities as supporters of professionals who should adopt their concerns and approaches, than as equals in the educational endeavour. She suggests that the extent to which the agenda of the partnership is set by parents or community is often limited.

In the light of this critique then, the findings chapter of this study seeks to explore some of the commonly held assumptions and espousals of school leaders, ERO and the MOE about partnerships and increased collaboration leading to the subsequent raising of student achievement, as it applies to Maori through the ‘voices’ and experiences of the trustees at the centre of the study.

## 2.9 Maori perspectives of the governance model

What this literature review has been suggesting is that Maori perspectives on concepts of collaboration and partnership differ from those of Pakeha. It can be further argued that what was espoused as an initiative that would see Maori having an active participatory role in education has not evolved as intended. Maori are either elected or co-opted to boards of trustees inevitably as a minority group, and the reality has been that this form of democratic representation has not lead to the outcomes as envisaged. Johnston (1998) argues that the reforms were ineffective in delivering for Maori expectations because they did not move past cultural considerations (1998:237). Maori have differing viewpoints on representing their own iwi, which are contrary to Pakeha notions of representation in governance where single trustees are positioned to represent and make decisions on behalf of those who voted them onto the board. Johnston affirms this, suggesting that the Maori concept of “whanau” is incongruous with the notion of individual membership to a board of trustees, and that the concept of election or co-option is foreign to Maori inevitably resulting in a lack of equity:

Because Maori are more likely to be the minority on School Boards of Trustees, and because the Boards operate according to fundamental democratic procedures, it is highly unlikely that Maori will get a “fair hearing” on their Boards. Yet *Tomorrow's Schools* (1988) believes that Boards of Trustees will be fair to all (ibid:229).

The euro-centric governance concept implemented through the reforms can be seen to be a flawed concept, taking no account of the Maori ‘world view’ or differences in understandings about partnership and collaboration.

Another critique relevant to the above comes from Graeme Smith (1996) who contends that the governance model provided only an illusion of tino rangatiratanga, stating:

Many Maori operating with Boards of Trustees structures have mistakenly assumed that these structures give them some form of autonomy or tino rangatiratanga with respect to being able to exercise control on behalf of Maori interests within education institutions. The realities have exposed the strong influence and control maintained by the state (1996:229).

That is, the reforms arguably provided for ‘decentralisation’ rather than ‘devolution’ (Wylie 1995). As Smith & Smith (1996) argue, real authority for key aspects of

education such as Maori community input into curriculum, remained with the Ministry of Education and Maori participation in the reforms policy process were minimal. Further, at the level of school governance, while 'encouraged', Maori participation was not formalised in the legislation (Johnston, 1998), which rather placed the onus on Maori to build the partnerships.

Maori views and belief systems about consultation, decision-making and accountability were not taken into account formally in the reforms. Even had the reforms taken more account of a Maori 'world view' where partnership relationships are concerned, Maori might still have struggled to participate fully and achieve equity in educational terms. Smith & Smith (1996) contend that:

The demands of the reforms and the Treaty influence in education meant that Maori communities were often unprepared and without the skills required to take up roles in governance and to exploit any potential for greater influence. Community capacity was further diminished and fragmented by the entrenchment of Maori socio economic disadvantage via the economic reforms of the time which also decreased the possibility of Maori participation (cited in Graham, 2003).

And this is further confirmed by Simon and Smith (2001), who contend that Maori disadvantage in education, originated well back in the history of our education system:

The reforms further eroded Maori community capacity in education already weakened by urbanisation, cultural alienation and the closure of the Maori school system, where Maori communities had exercised much higher levels of influence in schools (cited in Graham, 2003).

Kanewa Stokes (2003) asserts that the concept of the whanau (governance) model is based on collectivism. 'Whanau members are decision makers by whakapapa or association to the collective group, rather than through election' (2003:34). This Whanau governance model, used by Kura Kaupapa Maori, has collective responsibility as a fundamental cultural requirement, with no one individual having responsibility for the success or otherwise of the provision of education for Maori students. There is a gulf of difference here between this and mainstream school governance situations. The 'collective responsibility' used by Kura Kaupapa Maori is totally incongruous with the partnership model adopted by the *Tomorrow's Schools* (1988) reforms.

Stokes asserts that:

Despite Maori and Europeans entering into a partnership under the Treaty of Waitangi, there has been a subsequent failure of the dominant culture to recognise Maori values or culture within the ongoing development of Society and State (2003:35).

Implicit in Stokes' writings is the idea that Maori educational opportunity cannot be enhanced through Maori representation on boards as whanau principles of collective representation are not recognised.

Recruitment of Maori to governance roles on school boards is one thing, but to set up an environment where meaningful, mutually enriching contributions to educational outcomes for students can be made by Maori and Pakeha in partnership is another matter. Further to that is the concern that many Pakeha trustees may have little understanding of, and consequently only slight empathy for Maori social and cultural mores.

In a quote from a discourse around Equal Employment Opportunities for Maori, Marianne Tremaine encapsulates an issue, perhaps even a dilemma applicable to Maori in governance situations:

For EEO to be effective in terms of retaining Maori within an organization, ideally a more Maori-friendly culture is needed where Maori do not have to turn into Pakeha at work and revert to being Maori only when they leave work at the end of the day (1994:77).

What is alluded to here highlights the inequities of Pakeha governance for Maori in terms of the roles they are asked to play for both whanau and the board.

## 2.10 Summary

Government and Ministry of Education rhetoric continues to encourage school boards to seek Maori participation in governance. In *Better Relationships for Better Learning* (MOE, 2000) trustees are encouraged to consider policies of having a 'dedicated position' on boards for Maori, or 'co-opting' as a means of addressing imbalance in community situations where the Maori population is in the minority. The resource states that this is one way of ensuring that the school complies with the legal

requirements in relation to Maori under the Education Act 1989 (2000:13). Similarly, the National Administration Guidelines and the Whakaaro Matauranga education strategy (2001) have been developed to assist schools to develop policies and practices that will enhance whanau participation in education, and therefore improve Maori student achievement. Although some progress has been made in comparison to the early reform years, the ‘dichotomy and the void that separates the two trains of thought (Maori and Pakeha) still exists at a structural level and power relation level of Aotearoa New Zealand’ (Graham, 2002:96) due to the ‘deficit mono-cultural framework under which society operates’ (Graham, 2002:97).

At community level, ‘desirable partnership is more likely to occur between boards and their Maori communities on an individual basis, depending on situational factors (Johnston, cited in Olssen and Matthews, 1997:33) and the goodwill of trustees and school leaders.

For schools to have policies that focus on Maori involvement on boards, but which ignore the associated environmental problems is understandable, but a continuing lack of attention to these may affect the retention and quality of participation by Maori in this important area of education.

This research thus sets out to explore the notion of partnership relationships within a governance setting where Maori are trustee members of school boards in mainstream primary school situations. My research seeks to highlight the experiences of Maori as school trustees, and identify issues regarding successful partnerships for both Maori and Pakeha in governance situations. The findings that follow will record and illuminate some of the successes or otherwise of trusteeship for Maori, offering insights into the complexities of a mono-cultural governance framework from a Maori perspective.

## CHAPTER THREE:

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

#### 3.1 Why qualitative research?

Before deciding to use a qualitative research methodology for this study, I first considered past debate about the best forms of research. Anderson and Arsenault (1998) described valid research as being founded on the scientific method, which ‘formulates a hypothesis from theory and then collects data from the observable consequences of the hypothesis to test its validity in the real world’ (1998:4). Quantitative research was always seen as far more legitimate and measurable than qualitative research, with Scott and Usher (1999) describing early views on qualitative research as being ‘soft, unrigorous and subjective’ (1999:10). More latterly the integrity of the research has been seen as far more worthwhile to the research community, with Wagemaker (1992) describing the measure of a good piece of research as being more to do with rigour and internal consistency (1992:37). Consequently, I chose qualitative research as an appropriate methodology to adopt as the assumptions made in this approach best fit the type of research question for which answers are sought.

The research investigates Maori trustees’ understandings, perceptions and experiences of their governance role, their expectations of the role, and the expectations on them by whanau and other trustees. The use of qualitative inquiry allows the researched to voice their experiences the way they see them, while allowing me as researcher to address the issues by ‘reshaping it away from a “one best way” approach to the generation and legitimisation of knowledge about the world’ (Lather, 1991, cited in Bishop & Glynn, 1999:104). The intention has been to highlight the successes, failures and ongoing issues of the *Tomorrow’s Schools* (1988) governance model for Maori in their roles as trustees. Lincoln (1993) asserts that ‘social sciences cannot simply develop grand narratives of the silenced without including the voices and understandings of marginalised and silenced communities’. For this reason, the use of



semi-structured interview, outlined later in this chapter, is a most appropriate tool for my research.

Tolich and Davidson (1999:26) argue that in qualitative research there are a number of assumptions about reality, including that it is socially constructed, and that variables for investigation are complex, interwoven and difficult to measure. Working within these assumptions, I placed myself inside the study in what Geertz (1973,1983) describes as the emic perspective as gaining the 'insider's point of view.' My current experience as a Leadership and Management adviser to schools and previous experience as a primary school principal renders me an 'insider', having worked along side school boards on governance issues and having some prior bias in terms of my own views on what I have observed over time as an under-representation by Maori in governance.

Manning (1997) argues that one of the purposes of qualitative research is to discover and interpret meaning from the respondents rather than researcher's perspective. Lather (1995) and Connelly and Clandinin (1990) state that an emic perspective decentres the researcher's traditionally privileged perspective as the knower in the research setting, and that the interviewee is given the time and space to tell their story so that it gains a sense of authority and validity.

Lather (1995:57) cautions against the trap of 'tidy narratives' which may lead to simplistic theorising that struggles to be fair to the interviewees 'who share their lives and stories'. This simplicity was something I was mindful of in my choice of semi-structured interviews instead of survey, structured or group interviews. With semi-structured interviews I hoped that the interviewee would have a greater control over the direction of the interview even within the generic question framework.

The research took place within a specific context and an endeavour was made to interpret "what is going" on in the relationships (Tolich and Davidson) between the participant Maori trustees and other members of the board and community from the Maori participant's perspectives. The research thus used an inductive facilitative approach where the theory was generated from interview situations. Blaikie (1993)

lists as one of the four stages of inductive inquiry that all facts are observed and recorded without selection or guesses to their relative importance, and that the facts are analysed, compared and classified without using hypotheses. He also adds that the data collected is usually “soft” data, meaning it is rich in description of people, places and situations (1993:137).

Janesick (1994) states that qualitative research design usually starts with a question that involves interaction with people so that the researcher can understand something of the meaning of the participant’s lives in their own terms. This means that the research is carried out in naturalistic settings such as in the participant’s homes or workplaces with the researcher as the research instrument. Denscombe (2003) contends that naturalism is hugely important to ethnographic research stating that ‘Going into the field to witness events first hand in their natural habitat lies at the very heart of what it means to do ethnography’ (2003:90). While my research was not strictly ethnographic in its definition there are some similarities in the methods I have used as alluded to in Denscombe’s statement above. For example, the interviews were conducted at times and at places convenient to the trustees such as their homes, their school or their local marae.

An advantage of qualitative research for the researcher is that it allows for flexibility in approach. The possibility that the research programme would need to be reconstructed to take account of changing circumstances is discussed by Bogden and Biklen when embarking on qualitative research:

We have a friend who, when asked where she is going on vacation, will tell you the direction she is travelling and then concludes with, “I’ll see what happens along the way” (1992:58).

Using qualitative research allowed for the potential modification of research direction as the need arose. The use of semi-structured interview allowed me to ask subsidiary questions and explore different areas as they arose. An example of this was the subsidiary question on whether gender played a part in tensions and/or difficulties for Maori trustees in their relationships with whanau.

### 3.2 An exploratory case study approach

A qualitative case study research design was adopted, using an interpretive, inductive methodology. Researchers have struggled over whether case study should be defined as a process (Yin, 1994), a unit of study (Stake, 1995) or as an end product (Merriam, 1998).

A case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomena within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomena and context are not clearly evident (Yin, 1994:13).

Merriam (1998) has identified some special features that further define case study. He calls these pluralistic, descriptive and heuristic. In looking at the pluralistic nature of case studies, Merriam looks at how the case focuses on a particular situation, event or programme. Shaw (cited in Merriam, 1998) tells how case studies:

...concentrate attention on the way particular groups of people confront specific problems, taking a holistic view of the situation. They are problem centred, small scale, entrepreneurial endeavours (1998:29).

This is an appropriate approach for research which sought to explore how a group of Maori trustees are able to define, come to terms with and then confront any problems they might encounter in their role as a trustee within a governance structure that is not a Maori kaupapa. My study aimed to build a 'thick description' (a term taken from anthropology) to build up a robust description of the phenomenon (Maori trustee experiences) under study. Merriam (1998) describes this type of case study as 'holistic, lifelike, exploratory and grounded' terms that are important to my research on Maori in a governance role.

Although justification and the reasons for research can be many and varied, some writers on research theory reach the same conclusion as John Clark (1997):

...whatever the driving motivation, the over-riding consideration must surely be to obtain knowledge, worthwhile knowledge, which can contribute to an improved understanding of educational processes, and be conducive to human betterment (1997:160).

Indeed some researchers believe that some types of research should be strongly underpinned by principles of social justice (Griffith, 1998), and that the research should include a commitment to an improvement in social justice for the participants

and a gain in knowledge that can then be applied. I agree with this approach and for this to happen I adopted an empathetic interviewing approach as the main method of data collection aiming to become 'an advocate and partner in the study, hoping to be able to use the results to advocate social policies and ameliorate the conditions of the interviewee' (Scheurich, 1995:241).

But while I have an interest in the problems and issues of Maori trustees I am mindful that I am not in a position to effect the direct positive change that Scheurich speaks of. Analysis and decision making for change is made by, and actioned in the community, rather than provided/imposed by outside researchers and policy makers (Stringer 1999; Bishop 1996; Smith 1999). So it is hoped that my study's findings will be of interest and use to Maoridom, school boards, school leaders, and the Ministry of Education.

As mentioned previously, in working alongside participants I was not quite an 'outsider' having been a principal for ten years, and a school adviser for a further eight years, therefore issues of inter-subjectivity needed to be addressed. Inter-subjectivity is about the researcher sharing knowledge and own experiences with research participants. It acknowledges that the research can legitimately incorporate a subjective approach. As long as the researcher is open and honest in sharing knowledge there is less risk of a hidden agenda and the power the researcher has over the researched is reduced (Strachan, 1997). Indeed, I actually found my prior knowledge to be an advantage, assisting me in subsidiary questioning to obtain quality data.

Trustworthiness is also to do with issues of reliability, validity and relevance, which Aspinwall (1994), Bogden and Bilken (1992) regard as a key test of judging the adequacy, accuracy and comprehensiveness of the research. Denscombe (2003) states that reliability is to do with a research instrument having the same degree of consistency so as to 'produce the same data time after time' (2003:300) and that validity is to do with 'the extent to which research data and the methods for obtaining the data are deemed accurate, honest and on target' (2003:301). Because of the semi-structured nature of the 'journey' that the interview questions take, the reliability of

this research may be harder to establish. The validity of the research however, is established through practices such as ‘member checking’ (returning the transcripts to trustees for verification), and honouring the interviewee trust by giving feedback on the eventual research outcomes. Transcripts have been returned to the trustees who were asked to ensure that I had processed the interview accurately from their perspective. At that point transcription release forms were offered for approval via signature. All this has added to the trustworthiness of the research project.

For the purposes of ensuring that the research was consistent, the steps of the research needed to be set out clearly and concisely. Readers of the research need to understand the process and know how and why decisions were made in the research design. McMillan & Schumaker (1993) list features that ensure consistency as those which include giving detailed information on the role of the researcher and their relationship to the participants, the selection of participants, collection of data and the way the data is analysed. I explain the steps I followed in the following section beginning with addressing ethical issues to do with cross-cultural research, followed by a description of how Maori trustees were selected and interviewed, and how those interviews were analysed.

### **3.3 Ethical considerations and procedures**

The fact that I as a Pakeha researcher was researching the experiences of Maori trustees makes for some interesting possible complications to do with reliability, validity and consistency. I needed to be mindful of this in my approach. Mason Durie has indicated that anything involving *matauranga Maori* or traditional knowledge should not involve non-Maori researchers (Spoonley, cited in Davidson and Tolich, 1999:60). This may be a rather harsh viewpoint however, as he contends that non-Maori researchers might well have other skills that can benefit the community, and that a suitably negotiated research project can and should proceed (1999:60). This aligns well with points made earlier about research thinking which legitimises Scheurich’s assertions about ‘empathic interviewing’ (ibid, 1995:241).

Denscombe also adds that all ethnographic, and bicultural research in particular, therefore, calls for a certain degree of introspection on the part of the researcher. (2003:89). The bicultural researcher, according to Denscombe, needs to be reflective on their own life experiences, their personal beliefs and social values, that could lead to bias, which in turn may shape the way they interpret the results of their research. He calls this ‘the need for public account of the role of self’ (2003:89), something which early researchers did not emphasise or value.

Other researchers have recognised the ethical discourses of inclusivity and partnership as central to authentic cultural research. For example, Spoonley argues that:

...doing research on as opposed to with a group is untenable in post-modern research terms. It exploits power, knowledge and skill differences in a way that perpetuates ethnic exclusion and disadvantage (1999:56).

With this in mind, I sought ways to address what Rigney (1999) calls a “history of exploitation, suspicion, misunderstanding and prejudice” of indigenous peoples by previous researchers, by adopting an approach that respects knowledges, voices, experiences, reflections and which analyses their social material and spiritual experiences (1999:117).

At the commencement of this study I sought the advice and wise counsel of two Maori advisers with Kaumatua status within my own educational institution, TEAM Solutions, at the Faculty of Education, University of Auckland. Denscombe (2003), calls such people “sponsors” or “gatekeepers”, who can be very valuable to a researcher who is interviewing participants who are of a different ethnic group. My use of Kaumatua (Appendix A) was backed up by Spoonley (1999) who suggests that cross-cultural researchers employ expertise (apart from the researcher) to translate (if appropriate) and provide information in a culturally comfortable and acceptable way (1999:58). In addition, my proposal for study together with the procedures to be outlined next, were approved by the Massey University Ethics Committee.

### 3.4 Procedures: selecting, contacting and gaining participant consent

Because of the nature of qualitative research random methods of sample selection are not necessary. Stake (1995) proposed that the first obligation is to understand the case and suggested that the maximising of what can be learned is important. The case needs to be easy to access, hospitable, with the actors able to be easily identified.

To gain as rich a picture as possible I needed to select at least a range of six Maori trustees who are currently serving on boards within the greater Auckland area. The sample of six allowed for some comparison of emerging themes between the cases, while being a small enough sample to allow for an in-depth interview with each participant.

My approach in selecting the six trustees was to seek participants from varying schooltypes, sizes and situations, in different geographical locations, and with different decile rankings. State, Contributing Primary, Intermediate and Integrated Catholic schools were all represented by the six trustees. I chose to seek trustees from a range of schools because I knew that in interviewing only six participants, no generalisability was possible. I projected that there there would however, be some agreement on themes and issues from some or all of the trustees, and that finding commonalities across a broad range of school situations would add interest to my findings, and robustness to the analysis.

Participant identification was through a regional Ministry of Education database that identifies all trustees in MoE Region One by ethnicity. A letter seeking permission to use the database, together with an explanation of purpose, was sent to the manager of Central Resourcing, MoE Wellington (Appendix B). This letter was also sent to the appropriate contact at MoE regional office in Auckland. My selection of potential participants was made from that list and information letters were sent out to six trustees accordingly.

School principals and board chairpersons were not contacted for permission for the trustee to be interviewed because of the need to protect the identity of the participant

and school, and the need to ensure that open and honest communication between myself and the trustee about their experiences as a Maori in a governance position could be guaranteed without harm to the individual (Fontana & Frey, 1994).

I phoned the selected participants and explained the significance of my research to them, requesting their participation in an interview. I sought informed consent in writing (Appendix C). After agreeing to an interview, an information letter was prepared for each participant clearly setting out the purpose of the research, and giving an assurance that pseudonyms would be used for participants and their school (Appendix D). The letter also gave an assurance that data collected would be stored safely and used only for the purpose for which it was collected. This letter was also presented to the trustee personally at the time of interview where further explanation was offered and questions answered. I understood and valued the place and importance of ‘kanohi i te kanohi’ (Kiro, 2000:27; cited in Durie 2001) as a vital method to employ for initial contact and explanation of the research project, and indeed to any research involving Maori consent.

### **3.5 Interviewing**

I used semi-structured interview as the primary method of data gathering. Fontana and Frey (1994) state that ‘interviewing is one of the most common and powerful ways we use to try and understand our fellow beings’ (ibid:361). The semi structured interview is described by Connell and Kahn (1968, cited in Cohen and Mannion, 1997) as a two person conversation initiated by the interviewer for the specific purpose of obtaining relevant information, and focused by him (sic) on content specified by research objectives of systematic description, prediction or explanation (1997:271). The strength of using semi-structured interviews were that open questions could be asked and inductive reasoning used to draw themes from the data as it was collected and processed as transcriptions. Further, at all times the interviewee would have a degree of control over the interview direction and time frame in what Scott & Usher (1999) describe as a ‘weak focus, weak frame’ structure for interviewing (1999:112). This structure was very appropriate for interviewing Maori where the ‘power relations of gender and race are conveyed by the researcher and form an



essential backdrop to the answers that respondents provide' (ibid:109) as I was aware that there was a possibility of unequal power relations between myself as a Pakeha male researcher, and the all-female Maori trustees being interviewed. The potential for harm through the interview process was minimised by adopting an attitude of humility, together with an assimilation of the 'tikanga' of the interviewee and the local iwi. My use of 'sponsors' and my developing empathy for 'things Maori' was an important pre-requisite for the trust that was needed to elicit honest, open responses from participants. Anything less than this may have resulted in harm to the credibility myself as researcher, the interviewees, and the project aims.

While the semi structured nature of the interview had the potential to make analysis more difficult, it allowed flexibility to probe and explore other issues through subsidiary questioning. It also had the advantage of allowing myself as researcher to build a rapport with the trustees, providing a climate where both had equal status.

The interviews were based around several "umbrella" questions (Appendix E) to enable the interviewee to present their experiences thoughts and opinions, and were no more than approximately sixty minutes duration. These semi-structured interviews and the audio-taping allowed me as the researcher to gather and explore Maori trustees' views of reality and gain 'thick and rich' (Merriam, 1998) data. Denscombe states that qualitative research throws up information which, once analysed leads to 'thick description' which only becomes possible in relation to limited numbers (2003:233), in this case six participants.

### **3.6 Transcribing**

I chose to minimise any risk to the interviewee around transcribing by not employing any other help with the collection, collation and interpreting of data. Transcribing was my sole responsibility as researcher. Upon completion of the interviews, next steps in the process were outlined for each trustee. Transcripts were sent to trustees for verification, and each trustee was asked to complete a Transcript Release Authority (Appendix F) to allow for my use in the writing up of the research.

### 3.7 Analysis

One of the tensions for me in this qualitative research project was that the outcomes of my analysis might lead me to make assertions about Maori-Pakeha partnership relationships in school governance situations that were unable to be substantiated. Silverman contends that critics of interpretive qualitative research methods attempt to capture the point of view of the interacting subject in the world of naïve humanism...reproducing “a romantic impulse which elevates the experiential to the level of the authentic” (1997:248). Conversely, Danermark (et al.) asserts that knowledge about the world is socially constructed, and that society is made up of feeling, thinking human beings, and their interpretations of the world must be studied (2002:200). Keeping these two views in mind I embarked on reading, reflection and analysis of the interviews, with a reconciliation to all preceding literature. A vital part of the reflections undertaken by myself as researcher were to attempt to identify patterns and processes, commonalities and differences (Miles and Huberman, cited in Denscombe, 2003:272). In analysing the data collected from the various Maori trustees, I sought themes and interconnections that occurred in the data that pointed to a possible identification of answers to the initial research questions.

Large volumes of written data emerged from the research process. It was important for me to prepare for analysis by ensuring that all materials were in similar format, and that the transcriptions were presented in such a way that research notes and comment could be written along side the raw data. Field notes done at the time of the interviews were written along side the transcriptions to be used to illuminate points made at interview.

During the analysis of the transcriptions I noted particular words, ideas and concepts so that phenomena could be identified and categorised. Colour coding was used to identify sort information by emerging theme under each generic and subsidiary interview question. The key quotes were pieced together to provide an array of similarities and differences in data provided by the six trustees. By repeating this process with the transcripts new interpretations of the data emerged from the

distillation which consolidated my insights into each trustee's experiences. It was from this that resultant conclusions were made.

### 3.8 Summary

The research approach taken had both strengths and limitations. Semi-structured interviews allowed me to have a clear list of issues to be explored, which could be related back to the literature review. I was able to be flexible with the order of topics to be discussed and yet also offer the trustees a fair measure of control over the interview, developing their own priorities, opinions and ideas. The 'thick rich' (Merriam, 1999) information obtained enabled me to probe and pursue issues of governance pertaining to Maori, about which little other available research exists.

Yet, the semi-structured interview approach is noted by Nisbet & Watt (1984, cited in Bush, 2002) as being 'difficult to ensure reliability...because of the deliberate strategy of treating each participant as a potentially unique respondent' (1984:82). Therefore the research conclusions in the chapter that follows are not generalisable, rather they indicate themes and issues for Maori trustees in governance in the future. There were however emerging themes, and areas of agreement by the trustees and these are interesting in light of the diversity of the school settings from whence each trustee came. Among other limitations of the research was what Denscombe (2003) describes as the 'interviewer effect' (2003:190), where responses from each trustee were amounted to what they said, and not necessarily how it actually was. Triangulation of data with others from the participant's boards would have added to robustness, but this would also have compromised the sensitive nature of the research in terms of the different backgrounds of both myself, and the trustees. Bias is another limitation because of its potential to affect the reliability and validity of the interview. Cohen and Manion, (1994, cited in Bush, 2000) state that these 'sources of bias are the characteristics of the interviewer, the characteristics of the respondent, and the substantive nature of the questions' (1994:282). Given that, there was a possibility that some trustees may have given me the answers that they thought I wanted to hear rather than their real experiences because of my background with Ministry of Education contracts for principal and governance support.

Another less significant limitation of the research was that all six Maori trustees interviewed were female, and so the research does not contain a gender balance. The major reason for this was that the Ministry of Education database listing Maori trustees in the Auckland region revealed a greater pool of female trustees from which to select, than it did male trustees. In addition to this, I found that female Maori trustees were easier to make initial contact with. The limitation remains that there is a potential lack of balance in responses, with no ‘male view’ and a lack of possible cultural and kaupapa viewpoints that a male trustee may have provided. Both the reasons for this, and the male Maori trustee viewpoint, may well be an area for further research.

This chapter has examined some of the theory behind my choice of research method and has outlined the procedures used to collect and analyse resultant data. The next chapter examines and analyses the findings of my research under sub-headings which look at the many roles that Maori trustees play, and illuminate some of the partnership issues that face Maori in governance sixteen years on from the *Tomorrow's Schools* (1988) reforms.



## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **FINDINGS: THE VOICES OF MAORI TRUSTEES**

In this chapter, using the framework of themes that emerged from the data gathered during interviews, findings are presented together with relevant quotes from participants under each original broad interview question, and subsequent subsidiary questions. No attempt is made to examine each Maori trustee, or their school as a separate case, but rather a discussion of the emerging themes across all cases is reconciled to what other researchers have argued.

The chapter begins by introducing the participants and their school situations, looks at the complex nature of their roles as trustees, and the expectations that others have of them, and explores the issues they face in carrying out their governance responsibilities. Further, the trustee's issues are analysed and contrasted with available relevant literature to gain insights into the themes that emerge.

#### **4.1 Introducing the participants**

As mentioned in the methodology section, six trustees were interviewed with a cross section of school type, size and demography used. The schools that the trustees were associated with are not named, and the names given in the following brief profile are pseudonyms. Interview questions can be found in Appendix E.

##### **Tina:**

Elected trustee, and one of four Maori trustees on the board. School roll 13 (80% Maori), decile 4, U1 sole charge remote rural primary school.

##### **Leanne:**

Coopted trustee. School roll 460 (23% Maori), decile 8, U5 Catholic primary school.

##### **Pania:**

Coopted trustee. School roll 70 (62 % Maori), decile 5, U2 rural primary school, rural South Auckland.

**Martha:**

Coopted trustee. School roll 230 (27% Maori), decile 3, U4 urban primary school, Auckland.

**Marama:**

Coopted/elected trustee. School roll 430 (4% Maori), decile 9, U5 urban primary school, Auckland.

**Connie:**

Elected trustee, chairperson. School roll 290 (40% Maori), decile 1, U4 urban intermediate school, Auckland.

## **4.2 Pathways to trusteeship**

In talking about what had motivated them to become trustees there were many similarities in the points these Maori women made, as well as in their comments about their length of tenure and their prior experience.

Most of those interviewed had both personal and external motivations for being on the board. All perceived a need for Maori representation on the board, and three of the six were nominated by whanau. In two of these cases the existing board approached whanau and invited them to nominate someone.

In all cases where whanau had put the trustee up for nomination the reasons were given as a generalised need for Maori representation, as well as for Maori aspirational influence on the board in areas such as the promotion of tikanga and Te Reo Maori. This was the case for Pania, who said “They (whanau) asked if they could nominate me and I said that’s fine...because they wanted somebody here to try and implement Te Reo Maori for the school”. While Pania, Tina and Leanne were persuaded by whanau to seek a position on the board, others like Connie and Martha were approached by the board and/or principal, and in Connie’s case, part of her motivation was her own personal views about representation in terms of partnership and equity. She said:

My initial reasoning for getting on the board was because of Maori representation...I actually felt quite strong (about) Maori in mainstream education...that was another driving point for me, that even though we had the Kura Kaupapa Maori, there were still a lot of Maori children in mainstream schools like ours.

Marama had unsuccessfully tried to become an elected trustee in 2001 after moving to the community. After subsequent parent help and kapa haka involvement at the school, and after making it known to the then principal that (in her eyes) Maori involvement at governance level was desirable, she was coopted.

Prior experience as a trustee varied. Five of the six interviewed began trusteeship as coopted members. Tina was the longest serving trustee having served eleven years, while the newest trustee Martha, had been a trustee for just 18 months. Prior to trusteeship all had previous indirect links to the board, in fundraising roles (Martha, Tina), as Kaiawhina at an adjoining Kohanga Reo (Pania), kapa haka and other ceremonial tutoring (Marama, Connie, Tina, Martha), parent helper (Connie), and teacher aiding (Leanne).

Two of the trustees also had prior experience on other school boards. Leanne had been an unwilling recipient of the position of chairperson on the board of a small school in the far north seven years earlier, having been coopted after the then, mainly Pakeha board resigned over a “fall out with the principal...we were coopted on to pretty much salvage what we could for the school...it wasn’t a very nice experience at all,” she said. Connie had been asked by the Ministry of Education to be part of the board at a neighbouring school, which contributed to the intermediate school at which she is now a trustee. Her previous school had been part of a statutory intervention after its previous board was dissolved following a damning Education Review Office report citing, among other concerns, Maori community dissatisfaction around a lack of inclusion. “I found myself, that the Ministry (of Education) had confidence in me to maintain that link to the (Maori) community,” she said.

Significant here is the number of the trustees interviewed who were coopted rather than elected in their own right. As stated above, most trustees said that a primary motivation for becoming a trustee was the need for whanau representation, which is



not something that the non-Maori community would necessarily have been seeking. As a result, desirable levels of Maori representation on boards would be less likely, as many community members may well vote in elections based on their perceptions of the expertise needed being what Graham (2002:130) says are perceived as the 'real' governance areas like finance, property and personnel skills. In addition he asserts:

Lack of confidence, disinterest, apathy and scepticism of the education system and more specifically their own children's school are some of the more negative reasons given for poor parental participation in school governance (Graham, 2002:134).

Coupled with this are some findings discussed later in this chapter, where two trustees speak of whanau feeling "silly" and "not professional enough" to consider being good enough in Pakeha eyes for a role in governance.

Patricia Johnston (1992), in research conducted into how the *Tomorrow's Schools* (1988) reforms have served Maori, claims that Maori trustees 'have been predominantly located on community oriented sub-committees' and concluded that as such are 'located in positions that offered no direct decision-making in the running of the school' (Johnston, 1992, cited in Olssen and Matthews, 1997:94). The fact that five of the six trustees interviewed in this study were co-opted suggests that higher-level decision-making positions on their boards (such as personnel, finance and property) had already been filled through election, and that the board had sought Maori representation through cooption for other reasons. If this scenario is typical of many school boards, then the degree to which these trustees would be involved in higher-level decision-making within their role is debatable, and the marginalisation of Maori through the present governance structure will continue to result in unequal power relationships between Maori and Pakeha in education.

#### **4.3 Wearing Two Hats**

Across the interviews, while some variation, common agreement emerged on concepts and understandings about governance roles, roles in representing the board, the wider community and whanau. The trustees spoke of their role in a 'representative' sense, incorporating an advocacy role for both board and whanau.

### *Understandings of role as a trustee and expectations of the board*

All trustees had a generalised grasp of their official role as a school trustee within the governance model, representing the school as governors directly accountable to government, and responsible to the parent community which they served. Tina likened it to being a member of a team. “Firstly (responsible) to each other, and then to the education of our children,” she said. Tina spoke of School Trustees Association training she had undertaken where she had learned that as a trustee her first responsibility was to the board, then to the wider parent community, and not necessarily to the constituent group in the community that may have voted for her. However, this governance expectation seems at odds with Tina’s unofficial board role representing whanau within a governance structure where the principles of collective representation are not recognised. As Kanewa Stokes states in chapter two, whanau members are decision makers by whakapapa or association to the collective group, rather than through election’ (2003:34). Connie, who is chairperson of her current board, saw trusteeship as “overseeing the governance side of the education”, and meeting the needs of the children through policy making. She had an understanding of the ‘governance-management’ dichotomy, following up with: “So I try not to get involved in the day-to-day management of the school”.

Marama was able to differentiate between being a trustee and being Maori in terms of the technical skills she brought to the board and the enrichment she could offer as a Maori. From an urban Auckland school with only 4% Maori roll, she saw herself as having influence over, and leading the school in “accepting and revering our indigenous culture” and ensuring “that the tone of the school embraces the indigenous culture”. However she saw her role on the board as firstly for the specialist skills in personnel and human resources she brought from her former work life. She said wryly:

I haven’t been elected as a Maori trustee. I think it’s cute that they have me there. In the community we live in Maori is not only not a priority, but it is not necessarily politic to be a Maori.

None of the trustees interviewed had any officially designated role within the board structure as a ‘Maori trustee’ and, quite apart from any other designated positions they might have held on the board, no documented job descriptions existed for them in this role. Despite this each trustee spoke of a unique and often unspoken expectation

where issues to do with Maori consultation, communication, and cultural or ceremonial events were concerned. This expectation from other trustees, as well as school leaders, evolved over time and in the cases where there had also been a previous Maori trustee on the board, the role expectation was 'inherited'. Tina saw herself as a logical successor to another long serving whanau member who had been part of the old school committee... "I took the place of Aunty X and later I was elected". For Tina, being tangata whenua (having ancestral links to the area) in a rural community, and being a trustee at a uniquely small school, her cultural links were extremely important to the board. Tina loosely termed her position on the board as a "whanau position". Unlike other positions of responsibility on the board, there was no job description for "whanau position". Tina's situation was similar to others interviewed, who labelled themselves as 'Maori reps' explaining that they were spokespeople for whanau, and a link between the board and staff, and the Maori community. Some trustees spoke of other tasks they performed on the board but, with the exception of Marama (Personnel) and Connie (Chairperson), none held decision-making portfolios such as above, or in Finance, property or Health and Safety, and this resonates with the assertions of Graham (2002) and Johnston (1992) that Maori are not well represented in the real decision-making within boards, being confined to sub committee roles.

Expectations in terms of the links with the Maori community were played out in different ways within each setting. However there were some common trends. Several trustees felt that they played a significant role in encouraging more Maori family involvement in the school, but it appears that the role for some had evolved in an ad hoc fashion, in the absence of any job description. For example Martha's principal, and some staff "suggested I stand for the board and felt that I would be a good board member to have," even though the role expectation was not made explicit. Martha was initially unsure about what she wanted from the role and what it would mean for her. She said:

I kind of believed that as a Maori rep I would represent all that is Maori and I'd be working closely with Maori people in our school and outside of our school. In terms of being Maori on the board....I wasn't too sure what I wanted from it, except to make a difference...and I'm not too sure that the board were totally sure what they wanted until they got to know the person that I was.

For Leanne the whanau representative role evolved over time. She said:

Initially I wasn't coopted on to represent Maori but in the five years that I have been here I have been like a liaison person who tried to get the Maori community more involved with the school, and so I've been a go-between between the Maori families and management as such.

Leanne also spoke of the board's expectation and appreciation of that liaison role as it made them feel more confident in their communication with whanau.

I think the BOT were quite happy for me to take on the role of representing whanau. And quite often when I have attended meetings I would be asked to deal with any issues of a Maori nature. I think they found it quite comfortable having me on board to discuss issues with and I think they sense some security that they have someone who can guide them in tikanga and doing it the appropriate way and being sensitive to the needs of Maori.

Connie highlighted board and senior management expectations in terms of understandings of the community. She said:

Trustees rely on me to sort of relay back to them on Maori perspectives about education and how our parents...and kids, their learning styles, and trying link back to what the learning structure is on the marae and within their own families and within their own iwi. Because I think with Maori children they are actually quite different in that way, in terms of having different learning styles.

There was also an expectation that Maori trustees would be a cultural and ceremonial link to the Maori protocol for both community and school. All were comfortable in this, with Pania, Tina and Martha feeling that they were making a valuable contribution to the board and the education of the children providing expertise on marae protocol, preparing students for powhiri, and being a first link with kaumatua and kuia from the whanau. Marama also played a ceremonial role performing and training others in powhiri, but saw her role as infusing tikanga into the life of the school "not as an item, but as a function, as a purpose, and as a another way of welcoming people to the school...rubbing influence on people, for them to love my whanau and find it palatable...that it's not actually a bad thing." In this way Marama was proactively finding ways to build partnerships between her whanau and the school. Ironically, although accepting the importance of this, both Marama and Connie also came from a slightly cynical perspective, seeing themselves at times playing an 'event management' role for the board. As Connie said:

There's also an expectation to be able to tap into the local community i.e. Kaumatua, and you know, that's really quite funny, because it's like well, when the school's got something on they know what their obligation is to have a powhiri, but it's almost like the expectation is on you to organise it yourself or find someone...it's a little bit hard, a link to ceremonial things as required.

There was agreement between by some of the trustees that their boards, especially non-Maori trustees, felt a measure of inadequacy and discomfort in their relationships with whanau, not knowing quite how to consult and communicate, and that this was ameliorated to an extent, through their roles as conduits to the Maori community. Leanne and Connie's experiences above highlight a 'remoteness of engagement' in terms of partnership with Maori by boards, which many well-intentioned boards may address through the use of a Maori representative, whose role it is to attend to the partnership responsibilities that the board have to the state. This is further highlighted by trustees experiences of the expectation to play a role in assisting the board with communication and resolution when conflict issues arose with individual families and students, or where there was a school wide issue that the board wanted to inform the Maori community about, or enter into dialogue with. While the sensitive use of these trustees by boards to seek solutions in conflict situations would seem appropriate, it is a deficit use of the role of Maori on the board and is example of how Maori trustees are corralled into sub-committee roles that prevent them from playing roles that are seen as the more important decision-making portfolios such as finance and property, and which inevitably become the domain of skilled Pakeha trustees.

In chapter two, Johnston (1998) argued that the education reforms 'encouraged' Maori participation in governance, but that because nothing was formalised in legislation the onus was placed on Maori to build relationships, and that this highlights the polarised views and interpretations of biculturalism for both Maori and Pakeha, and therefore interpretations of partnership have remained polarised to this day. The above suggests that the extent to which the agenda of partnership is set by these Maori trustees, or indeed by Maori communities, is limited (Vincent, 2000), because non-Maori trustees do not see themselves as participating in partnership with Maori, rather they merely give permission for participation and interaction to occur.

Where there were Maori trustee perceptions of a truer partnership within the board however, the common denominator was the principal who was more likely to participate in partnership initiatives rather than permit them or observe from afar. Tina gave instances where she liaised closely with the teacher (who was also the principal and a board member in her sole charge school) assisting them to organise and train the students in whatever appropriate protocols were called for... “At a tangi, the principal and I will always speak on behalf of the school at the marae”. And Marama, after not feeling confident about a previous principal’s commitment to Maori parents’ aspirations, felt happier with the appointment of a new, more empathetic principal and said, “I feel well supported as a Maori and really pleased that the (new) principal is not afraid to wave the flag too.” While this is an example of a more inclusive and positive partnership building, Johnston (1997) says that ‘desirable partnership is more likely to occur between boards and their Maori communities on an individual basis, depending on situational factors and the goodwill of trustees’ and school leaders (Johnston, cited in Olssen and Matthews, 1997:33).

#### *Whanau expectations*

For all trustees a significant whanau expectation of them in their governance role was to advance the place of Te Reo Maori in the school’s curriculum and learning programmes for students. Leanne, together with the whanau support group she had established, had been instrumental in setting up an immersion classroom within the school, something the school lacked, despite drawing a growing Catholic Maori roll from the surrounding district. The board had seen this as a positive initiative and Leanne was given the role of surveying the community to gauge community feelings and needs so that a case could be put to the Ministry of Education for funding. The whanau had wanted to send their children to the school because of its special character, but there was a feeling also that as a largely mainstream school, Te Reo Maori was not being provided. Making links between the school’s special character and the importance of a spiritual dimension for Maori, she said:

I know that a lot of families have said that the reason they send their children to the school is for the karakia, even if its not in Maori, but for that side of being Maori, so a lot are drawn to this school for that.

Whanau at Pania's rural school expected her to be influential in ensuring that Te Reo Maori was part of the school curriculum. "Its always the Maori language...that's what they (whanau) were always worried about". The majority of the Maori children from the area had been through the Kohanga Reo, at which Pania was Kaiawhina, and both she and whanau worried that the fluency some children had would be lost at school entry.

I'm more there for the kohanga than for the school, its all about the reo and tikanga, and that's what they really want. It's really hard but I haven't had no negative response yet.

For Pania, representation of whanau was not just present tense. Historical and ancestral links played a part in her representation. A recently deceased kaumatua told her the history of the land on which the school stood. She recounted:

He took me aside when he found out that I was on the board of trustees, and he says: (in a whispered voice) *'When I was at school my grandmother donated this land for the school for Maori children – this is what the school was meant to be for, Maori children, teaching Maori children'*. Because there wasn't many places that Maori children could go to learn about their tikanga... This is what it was donated for, was for a school for Te Reo...

The above illustrates the plurality of the role that Pania (and other Maori trustees) play in governance where they were expected to govern as a regular trustee, having an 'overview stance, and ensuring that the goals and objectives at charter level through consistent and appropriate policy-making' (Kilmister, 1990:30). In addition they were expected to lead school cultural events on behalf of the board, and be an advocate for whanau, both past-ancestral and present. Being able to participate effectively in governance at this level of complexity would be beyond many trustees, and Graham asserts that together with a lack of confidence, and negative educational experiences of Maori parents when they were at school, many Maori may not have the skills to participate at this level (2002:162).

At Marama's urban high decile school, the Maori parent community was small, with only seven families and 17 Maori students on the roll. Marama led a whanau support group for consultation purposes, to come up with initiatives to support the education of Maori students. Parents had chosen to bring their children to this school "because of its perceived level of mainstream academic excellence" where Maori medium

education had not been an option. Maori parents at the school had not previously had a voice but this in no way meant that they were prepared to forfeit their aspirations for the advancement of tikanga and Te Reo in the school. She expanded by saying:

The stigma of being Maori in this community...it's not positive, it is negative. Its not something that's celebrated...for Maori in the community who are also wanting to fit in and assimilate nicely with mainstream, its not too sexy to be promoting that you are Maori and promoting, or causing ripples or waves or tsunamis because you want to do something specifically Maori.

Led by Marama whanau aspirations, previously thought by whanau to have not been an option, were discussed at hui. The group met with the principal once a term to voice collectively constructed ideas. She said:

We wanted the children to stand tall and say that they're Maori, that they are indigenous and that they have a place here and it's a place they should be celebrated for its diversity, celebrated for its uniqueness, celebrated for its place in the world... So some of the things we have done is, go in and do kapa haka, they've (parents) seen that as a positive thing, we've had 147 kids come to kapahaka - it was like creating a 'new cool', where it is cool to be Maori. I brought in a Maori role model from ... to come in and talk about what it was like for him to be Maori and we powhiri-ed him into the school assembly – white kids, brown kids, and doing waiata...had speeches going, all the mihimihi, and it was about, for our Maori kids, its cool to be Maori.

Sadly for Marama's whanau, there was an expectation that because they had sent their children to a high decile, mainly European school, their aspirations for a Maori dimension in the education offered would be forfeited.

All trustees interviewed perceived one of their roles to be of advocacy for Maori within the school and community, and all were comfortable with that role expectation, seeing their voice on the board for Maori concerns or aspirations as an inevitable part of being a trustee. Leanne said:

I suppose it's to make sure there is a voice for Maori to be heard, to make sure that any issues concerning Maori are dealt with appropriately and that there's avenues available for any type of discussion to take place.

Pania also felt that in her rural school setting she acted as an advocate for Maori for a parent community who she described as quite shy. She said "If they needed anything...they might feel uncomfortable, I can approach them (the board) from the Maori community." Several trustees also mentioned that whanau expected them to



play a problem-solving/advocacy role in relation to behavioural issues and learning difficulties of their children. While using trustees as a 'sounding board' whanau also at times expected them to approach teachers, and to "come back to them with solutions and options, or even go with them and speak to the principal about it" Martha said, adding:

People approach me about how their children learn in class, behavioural issues... You know, like the child might be having some learning difficulties or incidents of bullying in the class, or boredom, and they may not feel comfortable speaking to anyone else so they come and see me.

Others, like Connie had experienced the same expectations from whanau who would come to her with concerns. However, she found the lack of knowledge and appreciation by whanau of her governance role, and their resultant expectations, frustrating, explaining:

When something goes wrong with old Johnny, they're the first ones to come over and say 'dah, dah, dah'... I certainly know where my role is in governance... and so it's a matter of relaying back to my people the fact that there are processes that have to be followed, and before you come to my level, use the processes that you have, because my role is actually a governance role.

And she was mindful of growing the capabilities and confidence of other whanau members as potential successors to her or to serve on other boards. She said, "Mine is the role to strengthen the links with the Maori community and get them active, not to do it for them." Where educational issues were concerned she was realistic about what school management needed to do to bring about more understanding for whanau, for example where student achievement reporting and data was concerned.

I've actually spoken to the principal about that and I says you know at the end of the day unfortunately 'stanines' and where they're at, I says, you're going to have to relay it a lot better because they just don't understand!

Like Connie, Tina, spoke of whanau in her school community having limited understanding of governance and where she fitted in, indicating that this ignorance was sometimes a catalyst for unrealistic expectations. Part of the reason for this was that Tina had been elected to what has been mentioned already as an unofficial 'whanau position', which did not have a particularly expansive role in past school committee days. "You know it wasn't like that when they were on there. I

mean...they were just put on...everyone just worked together, they didn't even have a (designated) position.”

In contrasting the trustees' experiences, it can be seen that depth of understanding of governance, and way representation of whanau had evolved, varied quite widely and was directly dependent on the environmental factors existing within each board situation, and each community. For example, Martha reported that she was comfortable in her advocacy role for Maori in that she brought concerns and issues to the board, something that Connie saw as inappropriate, and not conducive to growing capacity within whanau. On the other hand, the board at Martha's school appeared satisfied for her to continue in this role, perhaps convinced that this constituted desirable partnership between board and Maori community. Marama, appeared to have developed a direction for herself in terms of her role as a Maori trustee, in the absence of any specific brief from government or her board. She had made decisions to “bite her lip” in the face of other non-Maori trustees' lack of empathy or understanding in order to continue to be an advocate for partnership between the Maori community and the board by “rubbing influence on them...so that they will learn to love my whanau”.

#### *Underlying tensions*

For all trustees there were some tensions and difficulties in their governance role. These difficulties centred around notions of trusteeship as a distinctly different kaupapa from indigenous decision-making processes, and their relationships with other trustees and with whanau. Some trustees also expressed frustration over their inability to involve Maori parents in their children's schooling.

Trustees recognised that consultation, representation and the way decisions were made under a Pakeha governance structure were different from what they and many whanau had grown up with as Maori. For some, this brought its own tensions in their relationships with whanau, and in separating their own personal opinions and allegiances from governance requirements, and for others conflict between governance and whanau concepts of representation was an inevitable part of trusteeship and were not discouraged by it. For example, in addition to her trustee

role, Tina was also a member of the marae committee, as were the other Maori trustees on her board. She said “There is a huge difference in the way our meetings are run...there is a lot of talk and discussion and we don’t have to decide straight away, we might come back to it at another hui.” There was agreement on this from Martha who found it difficult to get Maori involved in school decision-making, beyond those peripheral activities because in her experience, Maori were not comfortable with Pakeha decision-making forums. She said:

It’s not a Maori way of doing things...we’re used to the marae, Maori sitting around talking, and on the marae you’re allowed to make mistakes, and be foolish, but in terms of in the Pakeha society a lot of Maori people have a sense of “you can’t do that”...you have to be seen to be professional, and you can’t be seen to not know...I think that puts people off the board because they don’t want to be seen to be silly.

It is not surprising that trustees felt this way as traditional Maori protocols at hui, such as powhiri, the sharing of hakari (feasting) and waiata have no equivalent in Pakeha society. Coupled with this is that concepts such as consensus agreement rather than majority rules, and kanohi ki te kanohi (face to face communication) instead of newsletter communication for example, are not usually part of the way boards of trustees operate. Collective voice, rather than representation as an individual is also a traditional part of the Maori decision-making process (Johnston, 1997), and many Maori see the communication and consultation structures of governance too formal an environment for them to feel comfortable in which to participate. This is an indicator that Maori views and belief systems about consultation, decision-making and accountability were not taken into account formally in the reforms (Smith & Smith, 1996). While both Tina and Leanne recognised the differences that exist between Pakeha governance and Maori decision-making methods, they were philosophical about their experiences. Leanne said:

I think that’s been a really good basis for me to operate in both areas...if I didn’t have the upbringing and I had have been traditional Maori I would probably find it really frustrating, ...its different from how Maori deal with it. They sit and talk, and they talk until the issue is dealt with...I suppose that would be frustrating for a lot of Maori, especially if they don’t know why those structures are there. I try not to make any huge decisions on my own because that just wouldn’t be tika.

Leanne refers here to the lack of knowledge that Maori parents have about board structure and governance protocol being a disadvantage for them, and also highlights

the gulf between Maori and Pakeha in terms of representing parental views. Leanne felt unable to make unilateral decisions on behalf of whanau preferring, as did Marama earlier in this chapter, to take issues back to whanau for further consideration. Naturally individuals, whanau, hapu and iwi within Maoridom hold different perspectives, and to treat them all as a homogenous group is a flawed aspect of the reforms, and yet another example of what Graham (2002) terms the state not recognising 'the dynamism of Maori' (2002:158).

For some trustees it was difficult when tensions arose with whanau. Connie described her time in 2001 as part of a new board whose brief, together with a commissioner was to turn a failing school around, as "my most trying time". Brought in by the Ministry of Education to represent the Maori community Connie "copped a bunch of flack" from whanau, and previous board members "who didn't show for meetings...it was more or less an instance where the board had to stand down and let the experts take over." Although welcoming the Ministry's assistance, Connie felt that the role she was asked to play by the Ministry wasn't easy for her relationships with the community, but felt she needed to support the intervention for the sake of children's education. "I won't say I shied away and in the end the Ministry had confidence in me to maintain that link to represent the community," she said. She felt that her ability to negotiate the two worlds of Pakeha governance and representation of whanua had resulted in strong current relationships with whanau, saying "I think a lot of them actually respected me and looked up to me in terms of providing guidance."

For all trustees, the relationships they had with fellow trustees, particularly the principal and chairperson, were pivotal to their role as a Maori in governance. Pania punctuated her interview with references to how relationships between whanau and the previous principal at the school were strained and that the principal was not welcoming or empathetic to Maori aspirations for Te Reo to be taught in the school, saying for example, "You felt like you were outsiders to the school...you were nothing...it was like 'You don't come in here'." In contrast the newly appointed principal at the school had been more embracing of whanau, and 'things Maori' in general. This made Pania's relationship with this principal and the board easier and she appreciated that they were more open to discussions about whanau aspirations. Marama also highlighted the importance of the relationship between herself and the

principal by commenting how that was an indicator for her as to how the principal viewed the school's obligations to the Treaty of Waitangi. She explained that as a new parent to the school, she had enquired about what policies the school had on the Treaty and what programmes they had for Maori children. She was assured by the principal at the time, that it would be his personal commitment to have her son "up to the standard of the other children". She said incredulously:

I was blown away...there was an assumption made that because my son was Maori he would be below par, and it said a lot to me about this school and its view of Maori children.

Marama's annoyance at the principal's deficit assumptions may not be isolated. Research being undertaken by Bishop and Berryman (2002) looks at the role of culture and language in Maori children's educational outcomes and explores issues of achievement stemming from cultural differences between Maori children, their families/communities and the schools they attend. These researchers point out that the mono-cultural organisation of many schools has historically excluded and devalued Maori cultural knowledge and practices, and that low expectations and 'deficit' assumptions about Maori culture and children continue to be prevalent in New Zealand society and schools. Later, at the time of Marama becoming a trustee at the school, a new principal was appointed who had more empathy with Maori aspirations. "I feel well supported as a Maori and really pleased that the (new) principal is not afraid to wave the flag too."

Both Pania and Marama's experiences above highlight how pivotal the role of the principal is in promoting and developing partnerships between Maori and Pakeha. Indeed all the trustees spoke of their principal, and the chairperson, as being significant as to whether or not effective relationships developed between school and whanau. Other trustees had also had negative experiences with principals who were not embracing of whanau aspirations, and in their view if the principal was not supportive of Maori then the rest of the board were unlikely to be either. It is disappointing, though not surprising, that this sort of pepper-pot partnership in schools is dependant on 'situational factors and the goodwill of trustees and school leaders' (Johnston, cited in Olssen and Matthews, 1997:33). Graham (2002) asserts that despite the 'good intentions' of some school leaders who embrace the

recommendations for boards in such publications as *Better relationships for Better Learning* (Ministry of Education, 2000) improved partnerships in schools are unlikely 'unless Maori conceptions of the Treaty of Waitangi, biculturalism and of partnership are recognised at the highest structural/Ministerial levels of Aotearoa New Zealand' (2002:84).

Marama's interactions with her fellow trustees were positive at a personal, individual level, but as a Maori, Marama often found her interactions with non-Maori trustees frustrating and even hurtful. When asked to elaborate she said:

We'll be sitting at a board meeting and, there'll be a smart email come across about Maori wanting the airwaves or Maori wanting this or that...and it'll be directed at me. Ha, ha, very funny...and I know its not done to denigrate me or my whanau, but it is about their total unawareness of what their comments, or what written comments are made may feel for me.

In Marama's time as a trustee she has endured some underlying racism, sometimes overt as in the above case, and sometimes more subtle, as in the example where the past principal made assumptions about her child's academic potential. Both forms of racism are an indication of bigger underlying Maori/Pakeha power struggles, the former an example of a lack of recognition by Pakeha of a 'Maori world view' and the latter a damaging, perhaps self-fulfilling indictment on society's low expectations for Maori achievement. The 'airwaves' story that Marama related is an example of how traditional Maori knowledge, beliefs and practices are seen by a majority Pakeha society as being without scientific basis, therefore invalid. Such thinking propagates Pakeha 'beliefs in the inferiority of Maori language and culture, and the belief of Pakeha supremacy of their own language and culture' (Johnston, 1997, cited in Olsen and Morris Matthews, 1997:89). These attitudes to things Maori permeate our dominant Pakeha society and seriously subjugate the value of the knowledge of other ethnicities, particularly Maori culture. A localised example of the subjugation of the Maori 'world view' can be seen in the debate two years ago over the taniwha 'holding up progress' on the Auckland-Hamilton expressway development. What existed was a playing out of 'dual views' about our country and our world. For the most part these worlds coincide, but not where cultural metaphors for Maori exist. For Maori, the existence of a taniwha living on the banks of a certain point in the Waikato River signalled death and danger. The stretch of State Highway One on the river has seen

repeated deaths and car accidents, and so for tangata whenua the matter required a ritual response that resulted in a delay to the project. The matter then came to the attention of the media with much belittling of such Maori cultural metaphors played out through talkback radio and newspaper editorials. What was not highlighted in the debate was that pakeha New Zealanders also have cultural metaphors. These metaphors can be seen in the form of white crosses on the roadside at danger spots along this same route. These crosses, decorated with flowers, and with names and messages written on them, can all be seen as Pakeha (Christian) cultural metaphors. Selective reasoning, as it relates to different cultural “world views” would seem to still apply today just as it has done in the past, and can be seen as the racism that is so damaging to partnership, as Karen’s example above demonstrates.

While frustrated with her negative experiences, Marama was not put off trusteeship and was positive about the incremental influence she could have in her aims to make the school a place where Maori have “equitable ability to participate”. Joe Doherty (cited in Sayers & Tremaine, 1994), in an article about Maori perspectives on Equal Employment Opportunities draws parallels with Maori in governance roles:

It can be depersonalising to work as a change agent within the public service because you are dealing with areas that affect your own values deeply and yet you have to work in terms of a rationalistic process (1994:263).

Clearly, Marama compromises herself to achieve higher order partnership and better outcomes for her own child and whanau: “I find myself doing a lot of ‘soul-selling’...I have to bite my lip”. Marama’s experience may well typify the experiences of other Maori trustees, doing little to encourage partnership or future participation in governance by Maori.

Trustees felt that an unspoken task required of them by the board as Maori was to encourage and broker more Maori parental involvement in their children’s education and beyond that, governance. Most had a degree of awareness that promoting New Zealand’s dual heritage was a government goal through the National Education Guidelines, but some were frustrated at the gap between the rhetoric and the reality when it came to achieving such an outcome, and a lack of practical support from the Ministry. As a consequence, lack of success in achieving wide Maori community

involvement was a further tension at times. Trustees' thinking around reasons for the difficulties in getting more Maori involvement in school varied. Martha cited Maori parents' work commitments, parental transience and money constraints as reasons for non-involved. This view is supported by Graham (2002) who found that while encouraged to participate in governance and other partnership initiatives, the economic status of many whanau, coupled with the importance of their work commitments, often resulted in poor attendance at school hui, a situation that he asserts may well be typical nation-wide (2002:135). To counter this Martha's board had been prepared to trial various meeting times and places for whanau hui, but with limited success. She also had a belief however, that Maori parents were more inclined to become involved in peripheral activities of a cultural or sporting nature and that they did not see themselves contributing to the education offered by the school through consultation. In regard to procuring whanau involvement in the school, Martha and other trustees were set up to fail by the state. As has been discussed in chapter two, the education reforms since 1989 have been high on advice but low on guidance, with documents such as *Tomorrow's Schools* (1988) stating that boards of trustees were to be a mechanism to foster partnership between schools and their Maori communities, without specifying guidelines for how this partnership could be effected (Graham, 2002:151). Even nearly twelve years later, *Better Relationships for Better Learning* (2000), although full of good intentions and positive approaches, was characterised by the ill-conceived naivety that community consultation would be the same for every Maori community (Graham, 2002:156).

Connie's experiences affirm those of other trustees. She was able to get Maori parents to what she called "school participation level", but she said: "I have not been able to get Maori up to governance level", observing that such roles were uncomfortable for them, making any form of succession planning incidental. She said:

Its really quite hard, because you've got people who really think they need to be something or someone to be at that level... They are probably a lot more forceful in a Maori forum and whanau meetings, that's where I see them sit.

Leanne acknowledged that Maori parents often did not understand governance and had a fear of the board, saying:



There are too many out there who think that what the board of trustees says is in stone and they have no input whatsoever...even though we make it very clear that they do. We have a voice but we haven't taken advantage of that yet.

She emphasised the marginalisation of Maori parents by the present governance structure, noting also the education gap between Maori and Pakeha. She said: "I just wish there was more educated Maori parents out there to go out into the community and talk to them (whanau) in a way and a language they understand, and they don't have to be scared of the board of trustees."

Here, both Connie and Leanne highlight the Maori community's lack of confidence and skills to which other interviewees also alluded. In doing this they add weight to arguments from those who assert the inappropriateness for Maori of the present governance model (Graham, 2002; Smith, 1999; Court 2005; Johnston, 1997), where the structural inequalities of the reforms have rendered partnership superficial, and benefiting those (Pakeha) who designed and implemented the system (Bishop and Graham, 1997; Bishop and Glynn, 1999).

All of the trustees interviewed were female and before embarking on the interviewing for this study I added a question which explored any potential conflict for women representing whanau. In this regard I may well have been the victim of my own paternalistic assumptions about the place of women within Maoridom as all the Maori trustees felt that their gender was not a significant factor in the success or otherwise of their governance role. Where Maori protocol was concerned, trustees enlisted the support of kaumatua, or those with relative status, as in the case of Martha, whose male whanau were supportive of her because she had been "raised by the old people" and taught the whakapapa and protocols of her people. She said: "There's no problem with me speaking on behalf of whanau on the board...but I take a back seat when our kaumatua steps onto the grounds." Most of the trustees acknowledged in their interviews that they were from different regions, and as such there were 'tribal, hapu and whanau variations in the role of women' (Smith, 1997, cited in Middleton and Jones, 1997:40). However they indicated that their role as a female trustee representing whanau was seen as different from traditional Maoridom. As an example, Connie contributed that as chairperson, she was involved in fronting major

school events on behalf of the school and the wider community. She said: “If it’s consultation with my own whanau then I will run with my Maori protocols, so I’m going in and out of role according to the situation, and I will call on my kaumatua as I need.” From the trustees’ contributions to this study, there appeared to be no gender barriers in their trustee roles, adding support to Smith’s (1997) suggestion in an article about mana wahine discourse that ‘Many Maori women would argue, for example, that it is they who hold real, political power and that men who speak are doing so at their invitation’ (ibid).

#### **4.4 The Treaty and trustee voices about partnership**

Trustees’ responses were varied on their understandings of the board’s obligations to the Treaty, and about the degree to which partnership existed for them and their board. This section of chapter four explores these responses and along with trustees’ perceptions as to how partnership could be enhanced. As discussed in chapter two, the *Tomorrow’s Schools* (1988) reforms recommended partnership relationships between Maori and Pakeha be enabled through boards of trustees, and that partnership would be brought about through school charters aligned to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. All legislative amendments, reviews and remodelling of the education system of the time were intended to ensure that the Treaty was acknowledged as an important step towards biculturalism. Most of the trustees however, were unable to say what the board’s specific obligations to the Treaty of Waitangi were in a governance sense. And although most knew that these obligations were contained within, if not inherent in their school’s charter, few of the trustees had ever been at a board meeting where an exploration of, and possible implementation of Treaty obligations had been discussed. Two trustees were able to discuss their understandings of the board’s obligations to the Treaty and the role they saw themselves playing in relation to this. Marama had a working knowledge of the Treaty and attempted to lift its status within the board and school. Contributions she had made since becoming a trustee had involved the use her human resources skills. She had taken Treaty of Waitangi training workshops for teaching staff, been involved in developing interview questions for new teaching appointments around Treaty issues, and co-reviewed board policies with what she described as her “Maori view of things”. Connie saw the board’s role (in terms of Treaty obligations) as not

just one of developing policy in a compliance sense, but rather in implementing the Treaty. She said:

I actually in reading through the NEG's and NAG's and the charter saw that there was obligations that the school was required to meet under the Treaty and at that point in time I actually thought it was just tokenism... They're supposed to be guiding documents for schools, but do they actually work by them, are they sincere in their actions? Or is it just an obligation that they have to meet via the crown?

Connie felt that had she not been vigilant about pointing this out to her board and principal, the obligations to the Treaty through policies would have remained unfulfilled in practice, putting partnership at risk. Critics like Johnston (1993) suggest that 'the appearance of the Treaty in the school charters was seen as 'a tokenistic gesture that has no thrust' (cited in Graham, 2002:67). Graham (ibid) asserts that because there were no specifications or guidelines available to boards as to what partnership might look like, there was little hope that boards could fulfil their obligations to the Treaty, and address the 'unequal power relations that are prevalent between Maori and Pakeha in decision-making forums like school boards of trustees' (2002:66). The above recounts of trustees' experiences underline these criticisms.

Trustees shared mixed experiences as to their perceptions of partnership as it existed in their board situations, and some gave examples of where they felt there was both desirable partnership and where partnership was lacking. Tina's experience with the principal on her board was positive in that she felt supported by a genuine willingness to share speaking and organisational duties when it came to hui and tangi in the community. Another indicator of positive partnership for Tina was a charter and strategic planning review where the board and principal had been proactive in gaining wide community input.

I think it's the first time I've seen so many of our Maori parents and Maori community members come out and play a part in it... and the outcome for that was quite overwhelming really – particularly of the non-parents, and some of our kaumatua that attended.

Conversely, her experience with the chairperson of the board, a farmer originally from outside the area, was tenuous at times. She felt there was a clash of values between Pakeha board members who wanted to "implement things that are all about dollars", and her whanau-driven brief as tangata whenua to implement "some of the

old values.” For Tina, partnership between Maori and Pakeha was always on a continuum, positive much of the time, and then lacking, particularly where dominant Pakeha board members’ views about desirable education outcomes were concerned, or where major finance and property decisions were to be made. Where curriculum priorities and related resources were concerned, Tina reported that other board members would refer back to the charter framework from *Tomorrow’s Schools* (1988) which, while seeming to allow for community flexibility for a ‘local curriculum’, also bound the school through curriculum guidelines (NAG 1), which had a more prescriptive approach to curriculum delivery. In this way, influence over what was taught, was always maintained by the rest of the (Pakeha) board, and at times whanau perspectives on learning programmes were subjugated. This resonates with what Johnston (1998) states about Pakeha interpretations of the Treaty of Waitangi being confined merely to a recognition of cultural considerations, but that beyond that, ‘inequalities in terms of issues relating to Maori decision-making and unequal power-relations...remained unresolved’ (Johnston, 1998:168, cited in Graham, 2002:67). Court (2003) suggests that this situation for Maori may be more than just isolated, pointing out that although through consultation Maori are able ‘to identify and articulate their own educational philosophy, values and aims for their children, opportunities for realising these in day-to day practice remained largely within the parameters of the state school system’ (Court, 2003:172). Tina also felt that whanau aspirations were undervalued when it came to the employment of a teacher of Te Reo Maori. While projected formally as being valued by the board, the ‘employment’ of a kaiawhina to teach Te Reo, was accorded a low status in Tina’s eyes through payment being made via petrol vouchers. While Tina understood the staffing limitations within which the board operated, she said dismissively that she felt “like it was a tokenism thing, like...oh, we will just give a few petrol vouchers to the kaiawhina. For me it was a little bit degrading”. In this example, there is a clear mismatch between the board’s espoused valuing of Te Reo Maori, and their unwillingness to fund the initiative in a manner which gave status to the whanau’s taonga. Tina’s goodwill in terms of her understanding about the constrictions of financing additional staffing masked her own grievance. In effect, Ministry policy around support staff funding placed the board in the position of having to balance competing demands, relegating Te Reo Maori to a ‘discretionary’ status. Fraser (1997) makes the point that there

needs to be a consideration of what he calls ‘economic social justice...to address the injustices and material inequalities that are grounded in the political-economic structure of society’ (Fraser, 1997, cited in Court, 2003:173). That is, the unequal power relations prevalent on Pakeha dominated boards, are further reinforced by government policy which effectively renders partnership between Maori and Pakeha as discretionary through the way funding is applied to staffing, and other resources. In effect, Tina’s whanau were unwittingly excluded by the board from realising these particular aspirations because of the social inequalities that were grounded in material under-resourcing by the state (Court, 2003:180). Although in many ways positive about the partnership that she felt existed with her board, feeling valued in an inconsistent and irregular manner as above was a point of grievance. She felt that as tangata whenua and a past pupil, the board were “lucky to have me...the times they realise how valuable that is, is when ERO come here, that’s when they really see what I contribute.” Expanding, she related experiences of being interviewed by Education Review Officers, along with other trustees, and “giving a good account” of her board’s efforts in such areas as community consultation how inclusive of Maori the board was. In reality that inclusiveness was variable, and dependant on the importance of the issue as perceived by the rest of the board.

For some of the other trustees, while satisfied with aspects of what they had achieved for Maori in their role, the indications were that two-way partnerships did not necessarily exist within their boards, and that their perceptions of partnership between Maori and Pakeha on the board and with the community oscillated on a continuum depending on what school issues were at stake. Martha appeared satisfied with the level of partnership she had with the board on behalf of whanau, yet may not have been aware that this had been brokered mainly through her actions, and not necessarily through any inclusive and proactive measures by Pakeha trustees. The partnership that existed appeared to be at an emergent level, and had been dependent on Martha as the conduit – the board communicated with Maori through Martha and vice versa. She spoke proudly of what she and the board had achieved for whanau, feeling that it constituted an empowering partnership relationship, and laying partial blame for a lack of Maori involvement with the school at the feet of Maori themselves, saying:

When it comes down to it, all they (the board) need is a willingness to listen and to appreciate that different ethnicities will do and say things differently...I don't know that there is anything more we can do as a board than to be open.

At best, the partnership Martha spoke of was a 'one-way' partnership, and consequently not a partnership at all. This kind of partnership was perceived by Martha's board as fulfilling its Maori community obligations, and its compliance obligations to the state through the school's charter. In reality they may well have absolved themselves of any responsibility to partnership with Maori, and therefore to participate in New Zealand's dual cultural heritage. Although similar in aspects to other interviewed trustees' experiences, Martha's board controlled the partnership which extended only to her efforts to inform and consult with whanau on issues that the board felt were important, relaying and clarifying board policy. As a consequence, only a low level of parental involvement was achieved, and participation in decision-making by whanau was non-existent. Martha's bewilderment and frustration over lack of parental involvement was possibly an indication that she had been subsumed by the dominant culture discourse, and 'colonised within the mainstream system' (Court, 2005:61). Connie observed that in her view, partnership in governance that relied on Maori trustees as brokers on behalf of the board, was not true partnership at all. "There's the expectation that it's always got to come from Maori to enhance that partnership," she said cynically, as if tired of the recurring outcome. Leanne also echoed these sentiments saying that "Partnership was reciprocal and couldn't go on being dominated by European ideas" repeating her experience in a small community where it was hard to get enough participation on boards by Maori because "they just didn't understand...this wall went up and just stayed up." Leanne's comments are commensurate with the assertion by Smith & Smith (1996) that the nature and pace of change required by the reforms meant that Maori communities were often unprepared and without the skills required to take up a governance role (cited in Graham 2002). Maori views and belief systems about consultation, decision-making and accountability were often not taken into account formally in the reforms (ibid). Coupled with board training delivery of the time which was often punctuated by jargon, it is not surprising that Maori parents exhibited apathy towards the type of partnership on offer.

Marama felt while relationships with fellow trustees at her school were positive at an individual level, she had carefully and proactively constructed that relationship because Maori families at the school were in the minority, and attitudes towards things Maori were tenuous. She said:

It's quite isolating being a Maori on a board of trustees...I have to watch what I say all the time because I want to encourage positive relationships. I'm really mindful...I don't want to damage what's been built already.

Clearly in the case of this board, the responsibility to promote Maori/Pakeha partnerships defaulted to Marama. Even outside governance, Connie saw that same reliance on Maori to promote partnership in the attitudes of teaching staff at her school, and was incredulous in saying:

Even though the school wanted to put in place a bilingual unit, there was an expectation from the other teachers was that all the reliance came back to the Maori teachers, and it just felt that...there were some things they could have actually assumed themselves...I mean that was their role, what do they call it...New Zealand's dual cultural heritage, and being able to relate some of that back...and at this point in time, and I'm not knocking teachers, but they feel that if you're Maori you're the one that should be delivering it. I felt that all teachers should be taking a role in this.

Here, Connie exhibits a grasp of the partnership issues for Maori, with non-Maori teachers seeing themselves playing no role in promoting what she terms 'New Zealand's dual cultural heritage', and pointing out the added workload pressures on Maori teachers as a result. McLeod (2002) supports Connie's perspective on this stating that 'The responsibility for Maori education in mainstream schools does not sit with Maori alone, Pakeha have a role as vital and as important to the success of Maori education programmes within mainstream schools (2002:173). Indeed, this lack of recognition of a participatory role in partnership by non-Maori is mirrored in the experiences of all six trustees' where there appears to be an expectation by other trustees that the 'Maori rep' will be responsible for eliciting partnership with whanau. This inevitably results in additional workload for Maori trustees, excluding them from optimum influence in other important decision-making roles.

Connie's example above, supported by McLeod (2002), indicates that there are pressures on Maori teachers to shoulder much of the partnership responsibility where learning programmes are concerned and that this may well be the case in many

schools. While these expectations here may be stressful for Maori teachers, whanau can also exacerbate this through their own expectations of Maori teachers. In the absence of structural change at state level to ensure partnership, Maori may inadvertently put pressure on their own people to promote partnership. This is the case in Pania's example of the Maori teacher at her rural school, who when appointed carried the hopes and dreams of whanau for increased Te Reo for their children, is an example of this. Pania said:

When the Maori community saw he was coming (to the school as a new teacher) they were like blown away, so over the moon...they did everything for him, because they were so rapt that there was a Maori teacher here who could speak Te Reo, you know, that this is going to be a stepping stone and they can open up to this guy because he's going to be it all to the kids.

What eventuated was a mismatch in expectation. Pania explained that the principal had told her that the Maori teacher, being a relatively new teacher was concentrating on crafting his teaching practice. Consequently for this, and other reasons that Pania was not able to determine, he was reluctant to teach Te Reo within his classroom programme. Pania continued:

But it's just a shame, because we as a community got it wrong. They actually thought that's what he was here for, to teach Te Reo, but he has kept to himself.

Marama thought that in terms of her board and its obligations to the Treaty of Waitangi, little partnership existed, and that the indigenous uniqueness of Maori was not overtly valued or recognised. Tearfully, she said:

I'm shaking my head because there is no partnership...there is more of a celebration for the Indian and Asian community, which is a larger group of people (within her school's community).

In my experience, Marama's board typify the often well-meaning actions by many boards to be inclusive of, and celebrate cultural diversity. In Marama's school, Treaty obligations were either not understood or ignored, and as a consequence Maori was given no special place as required in the huge body of legislation, official documentation, charters and guidelines that exist for schools. In applying the proportional representation concepts of 'equality' rather than 'equity' to their consideration of the competing demands of the differing ethnicities within their schools, boards relegate New Zealand's dual cultural heritage to a lower status, which



in the view of many Maori (including Marama) is hurtful and insulting. Saddened by her board's indifference to Maori aspirations, Marama was prepared to persevere in building better relationships. The indifference, she felt was partly because the Maori roll was small in comparison to other ethnicities, and partly because trustees had little appreciation of Maori processes for decision-making and representation. For Marama, the thought of making unilateral decisions for whanau, was as foreign to Maori as any form of dual representation was to Pakeha trustees. She cited examples of conversations with board members who were confused about, even indignant, that she had wanted to take school issues back to the whanau group for further consideration. She said:

In my experience...the process is different, it's not about one person making the decision...(other trustees speaking) *'So what makes Maori so special? Why go to a meeting and where they've got to take a kuia with them or a kaumatua? Why do they get to take someone else when there's only one of us?'* So you know, it's all that sort of thing...it's not about Maori having someone extra, its about flipping it around and understanding that a lot of tauiwi feel that they're being disadvantaged as opposed to Maori having equitable ability to participate, and I think that's the issue...its about having 'equitable not equal'.

Again, and perhaps with many boards, trustees on Marama's board had little understanding or appreciation of the concept of collectivism, which Johnston (1997:87) states is the basis of the philosophies underlying whanau, iwi and hapu. As such they saw her wishes to re-engage whanau with progress on issues as unfair, feeling it was up to the board alone to make decisions. Johnston (ibid) asserts that the notion of individuality as a trustee 'further reduces Maori collective interests to an aggregation of individual choices'...and 'contradicts Maori practices of collective decision-making, accountability and responsibility to whanau' (1997:87). Attempts by government to promote better partnerships between Maori and Pakeha in schooling have fallen short of addressing such fundamental issues as in Marama's example above. Graham (2002) says that, although there is much positive and proactive material for boards and teachers to implement in *Better Relationships for better Learning* (Ministry of Education, 2000), the guidelines for forming partnerships are 'too generic, and treat all Maori iwi, hapu, and parents and communities as homogenous' adding that the guidelines have been 'developed and implemented according to Pakeha conceptions of the Treaty and of biculturalism' (2002:89).

Graham feels that these guidelines are unlikely to be totally effective as they ignore unequal power relations that exist within boards. Throughout this study, the mismatch between collectivism and individualism, and the resultant inability and refusal by Pakeha to see Maori viewpoints, is a recurring theme.

Views about where the responsibility lies for enhancing partnership in trusteeship varied, with all trustees offering possibilities on how government, boards, teachers and school leaders, and Maori themselves could contribute to what they saw as ideal. Like other trustees, Leanne felt that Maori representation on all school boards was a prerequisite to meaningful partnership, although she also indicated that partnership was not necessarily guaranteed through representation alone, being tantamount to tokenism. Tokenism was a theme that Connie also alluded to citing the example of her sister who had moved to a Northland community where there was in her view, ineffective Maori representation on the board. She felt that the trustee was either apathetic or did not appreciate the issues and the responsibility she had, adding: “She (the trustee at that school) was not actually assisting the board to meet the needs of Maori kids...at the end of the day it all boils down to how Maori are you?”

Having an understanding of how the education system worked had been an advantage for Leanne “because there are a lot of Maori parents that don’t have a clue how it works”. Further, if Maori were to be elected or coopted to the board, she felt it should be the responsibility of both the individual Maori trustee and the board to ensure that they were enabled to represent Maori aspirations within the governance structure. But she emphasised that in governance, trustees’ personal viewpoints needed to be separated from the governance role, and that this highlighted just how difficult it was for Maori trustees compromising their cultural values in the Pakeha governance structure. This resonates with Tremaine’s (1994) assertion that in non Maori-friendly cultures in the workplace, Maori ‘only revert to being Maori when they leave work at the end of the day’ (1994:77), and this may be true of the situation for many Maori on boards. However, developing Maori-friendly board environments, as many boards already possibly have done, cannot be mistaken for having achieved desirable partnership between Maori and Pakeha. As Johnston (1999:78, cited in Court, 2003:176) states, ‘this approach is unable to address unequal power relations between Maori and Pakeha because Pakeha are effectively able to control the level and manner

of Maori involvement' (2003:176). Johnston (*ibid*) favours a Maori-centred approach by 'incorporating appropriate decision-making forums...by Maori for Maori'. But, as I have pointed out previously, Pakeha-dominated boards would be unlikely to be comfortable with Maori-centred governance initiatives within their communities, seeing it as a form of separatism and a departure from the individualism of the present governance system. Sadly, the legislative requirements of the education reforms are not conducive to any such radical, Maori-centred reinvention of governance.

Training for Maori trustees was seen by some trustees to be a responsibility of the Ministry of Education, and a vital step to more meaningful participation in governance for Maori parents and caregivers. According to Connie, training on Treaty issues should be compulsory for all boards, and this is supported by Graham (2002:170) who contends that a lack of Treaty training for trustees, including Maori trustees, is at least a partial barrier to continuing disempowerment for Maori. Connie also saw training for Pakeha trustees and trustees from other minorities as vital to any future improvement in partnership relationships within the present governance structure. In reference to her sister's previous example of the school in the north that had had ineffective Maori representation on the board, she alluded to a lack of understanding by many Maori and Pakeha of the complexity of the issues around representation, equity and meaningful partnerships between Maori and Pakeha because of their lack of knowledge or appreciation of Maori perspectives. She said:

The worst thing is that you can go to the board and you can speak to them and you don't know whether they have actually understood what you are saying from a Maori perspective, and I found that out...trying to put your point across to a board of trustees who are made up of Pacific Island and European, I would say they couldn't really understand the perspectives coming through.

Further to this, my findings suggest that for a number of the trustees interviewed, the obligations that the board had to the Treaty of Waitangi were not well understood in the context of trusteeship. In this respect, and as previously mentioned, many Maori including some of those interviewed in this study, may well have been what Court (2003) and Smith (1992, cited in Middleton & Jones, 1992:49) describes as 'colonised', or 'absorbed into' the dominant culture views about equality, failing to recognise the more complex issues of equity as it apply to Maori-Pakeha partnerships on boards. Training was also a theme for Leanne. She drew on her time as an

inexperienced trustee in a 'high risk' situation in the far north school at which she was a trustee in the late nineties. She said:

We were so green, there wasn't really an understanding of what our role was. We were all young and unemployed, forestry workers and so on...they put us in a position of power, we didn't know what to do with it.

The "power" that Leanne and her whanau "didn't know what to do with" was intimidating for them. She felt that they were left to "salvage what we could for the school", abandoned by a disaffected Pakeha community in conflict with the principal, and by the state which forced them to govern within a structure, without the appropriate skills (Smith, 1996 Graham, 2002) with which to save their school.

While Leanne felt that in her earlier experience as a trustee she may have benefited from training, "delivered by Maori", who could demystify the jargon and "talk in a language that Maori people understood," she also commented that she did not have confidence that this would eventuate under the current self-managing system. Although board training was available on a voluntary basis, through the New Zealand School Trustees Association, she felt Pakeha trustees did not necessarily see it as a priority, seeing themselves as already having the necessary business and personnel skills to govern effectively. The current self-managing schools structure allows boards to decide their own training priorities on an 'opt in' voluntary basis, and while "choice" for individual boards about training needs would seem logical in a market-driven education system, equity for Maori is compromised by a lack of dominant culture interest in what many trustees might see as merely basic, unimportant training in comparison to the 'really important aspects' of governance. Marama's initial thoughts were also that training would make a difference in the quality of partnership relationships for Maori and Pakeha. Like Connie, she felt that training should be for boards generally, and while important for Maori it would be particularly beneficial for dominant culture trustees, because in her opinion the present school self-management structure "entrusts governorship of schools to people who have no regard for the indigenous or bicultural nature of the country". She felt that there needed to be a particular emphasis on the Treaty of Waitangi in training to expose existing and potential trustees to "what it means to us as a country, as a nation...to us as kaitiaki of the education service...otherwise we're further entrenching." Marama indicated that

under the current system of self-management, equity for Maori would be difficult to attain, given that non-Maori trustees are not bound by any requirement to seek training in Treaty of Waitangi issues as they affect governance. She felt that, although mentioned in many of the Ministry of Education documents and publications that come to the table at board meetings the “spirit and intent of the Treaty is lost on them (the other trustees)”.

While training about the Treaty has been suggested as a step toward an improved climate for partnership, this alone will not be enough. The marginalisation of Maori cultural aspirations through legislation continues to maintain the assimilation policies of the nineteenth century for Maori to abandon their culture to learn the ways of the dominant culture (Bishop and Glynn, 1999:13). Through the stories of the Maori trustees interviewed in this study, it is evident that the education reforms of the last seventeen years have not given Maori a partnership role in the decentralised world of school governance, and clearly there needs to be some form of radical review of how more equal power relations can be achieved. Those Maori parents spoken of in this study who lack the skills and confidence to participate in the education of their children beyond sporting, fundraising and cultural involvement, will continue to be underrepresented in governance unless there is more recognition at a structural level of Maori values, beliefs, and decision-making practices. There needs to be a re-culturing (Court, 2005) of the present system that might ultimately lead to what Eade (1997) in a discourse about schooling improvement in ethnic communities, calls ‘capacity building, to determine their own values and priorities and organise themselves to act on these as a basis for development’ (Eade, 1997:23). In doing this, Maori would collectively determine their own cultural and educational wellbeing, achieving the rangatiratanga promised them through the Treaty of Waitangi.

## CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

Sometimes it feels really frustrating because I can see the lack of equity for our people. And it's frightening to see that I am part of a decision-making body that has no awareness or affinity of the impact of decisions on Maori, and I can't side-step it, I can't pretend it's not there. It's isolating being Maori on a board of trustees. (Marama)

In the previous chapter of this research I have highlighted the perceptions of six Maori trustees about their governance roles and responsibilities, and the tensions and difficulties they face in trusteeship as Maori. I have interpreted their stories against a backdrop of literature available on the education reforms of the last sixteen years, and what those reforms promised for Maori in terms of partnership in decision-making within the current self-managing schools environment. This research illustrates that although the education reforms and subsequent government policy and partnership initiatives are well intentioned, Maori trustees have not been empowered to 'exercise a fair measure of influence over their children's education' (Taskforce to Review Education Administration, 1988:29) and that unequal power relations continue to be played out at both structural and policy level, as well as at local level on school boards.

While many of the stories from the six trustees demonstrated underlying inequities for Maori, each trustee did recount successful experiences from their perceptions, which were both directly and indirectly related to their governance role. All felt that their influence had extended beyond governance, and that they had been able to have a positive influence on educational outcomes for students at their schools. Each trustee also felt that their skills and knowledge had grown both in a personal and professional sense as a result of trusteeship, and that the new skill-sets gained had been 'mana-enhancing' for them. Several trustees voiced their satisfaction at having been able to make a difference to the culture of the board, and educational programmes for all students, and not just for Maori. One trustee, who had previously been part of a dysfunctional board in another community, had led an initiative on behalf of whanau to establish a Maori immersion class within her present school situation. All trustees had found their involvement in cultural and Te Reo Maori programmes for students and staff rewarding. Two trustees had made contributions to governance at a higher

level of decision-making level. One, through her human resource management background, had been able to support governance by sitting on interview panels and developing policies and programmes from a Maori perspective, while another had been a board chairperson of two schools in the recent past. Although these contributions have been significant, some trustees were not empowered to play a leading role in decision-making on issues as they relate to the Maori community. The roles they played were liaison roles, which precluded them from involvement in areas of governance where there was more power at stake. Through governance structures that have resulted from a reinterpretation by policy-makers of what Maori had asked for during pre-reform consultation (Johnston, 1997), decisions that boards make at local level still marginalise, albeit unintentionally, whanau aspirations for education. The result as evidenced in this study, has been a continuing confusion and/or frustration by these Maori trustees over their whanau's apparent apathy and non-involvement in their children's learning, and beyond that governance.

All trustees involved in this study experienced a duality in their role, with unspoken expectations by both board and whanau to be a link with the other. Trustees' responses showed that whanau were dependant on trustees to be their link to the board, often lacking the confidence and skills to approach the board themselves, or and economic resources to participate fully at a governance level. Pakeha trustees, who saw no role for themselves in fostering partnership beyond a 'toleration of difference' (Court, 2003), relied heavily on Maori trustees to act as their cultural link with whanau for both ceremonial and consultative purposes. Coupled with this, some trustees felt they compromised their own values and beliefs when making decisions, being tied to individual representation by the governance structure of the board, and yet bound culturally as Maori to concepts of collectivism. This 'clash of kaupapa' (Graham, 2002) was directly responsible for pitching Maori trustees into dual representative roles. Given the demands of this duality of role, and the resultant exclusion from high-stakes decision-making positions on the board, it is not surprising that many Maori parents exhibit apathy for involvement at this level of school administration and management (Graham, 2002:162). In reference to the Treaty of Waitangi partnership discourse, and the subsequent development of policy through the education reforms, Graham states that 'the concept of individuality was a

contradiction to the Maori traditions of collective decision-making' (2002:61). Much of the underlying tension experienced by trustees in this study centres around their own internal conflict in their collective representation of whanau, and Pakeha conceptions about individual representation which positions dominant culture decision-making methods as superior, and Maori decision-making kaupapa as inferior. This was graphically illustrated in the example shared by Marama in the previous chapter.

Although potentially a powerful foundation for partnership between Maori and Pakeha, the references to the Treaty of Waitangi in the plethora of policy documents and resource publications that have arrived in schools have 'lacked thrust', being no more than a 'tokenistic gesture' (Johnston, 1993). Maori and Pakeha have interpreted the Treaty in different ways, and until structural inequalities at government policy level are addressed, and filter through to school governance, trusteeship will continue to be a challenge for Maori. Through trustees' stories it appears that while boards often made genuine attempts to consult with whanau for better partnership, that partnership could never be guaranteed. Many of the stories illustrate that partnership and consultation are separate, often being confused by boards, and at government level, as being one in the same. While partnership has connotations of 'we'll decide together', consultation has connotations of 'tell us what you think and we'll decide for you'. This form 'partnership' takes no account of the different ways Maori and Pakeha view and practice consultation, and this is supported by Furman, (1998) who suggests a hidden agenda, stating that 'Overlooking differences between people often has more to do with informal means of control than with a genuinely negotiated consensus (Furman, 1998, cited in Court, 2003:179). Many Maori may well view non-inclusive board practices such as these with scepticism. This is supported by McLeod (2002) who states that, 'As stakeholders, partners do not expect to be jettisoned part way through negotiations once the consultation process is over and key decisions are to be made. This type of non decision-making acts as a means to subdue Maori interests (2002:22).

Also evident in trustees' stories are examples of the variability in the quality of, and commitment to partnership relationships within their board structure, with the quality



being heavily dependent on the knowledge and empathy of trustees in powerful board positions such as the principal and the chairperson. Without the goodwill of such key people Maori communities will remain marginalised and powerless (Johnston, 1997) at local level, and at government policy level. Indeed, throughout the interviews all trustees alluded to the principal as being a key to productive partnerships for Maori in the community, and this being entirely dependant on the principal's knowledge about issues affecting Maori, and their attitudes and empathy towards Maori aspirations.

Training for all boards in Treaty of Waitangi issues has been advanced as a way of countering the differing interpretations of the concept of partnership that exist between Maori and Pakeha (Graham, 2002, Johnston, 1997, McLeod, 2002). Two trustees also felt strongly that Treaty training be made compulsory. While the *National Education Guidelines* (Ministry of Education, 1997) require that schools operate consistently within the Treaty of Waitangi principles (Graham, 2002) the reality is that without exposure to the Treaty, and debate about what partnership may look like between Pakeha and Maori, as the indigenous culture of the nation, there will be little shift in Pakeha conceptions of the Treaty which recognise only its cultural aspects and not the structural aspects. Consequently, the unequal power relations which predominate will never be redressed in board and community settings unless government intervention at structural and policy level takes place.

Partnership initiatives like *Better Relationships for Better Learning* (Ministry of Education, 2000) show much potential Graham (2002). Other recent initiatives to become available to schools like Jill Bevan-Brown's (2003) 'Cultural Self Review' tool, evaluate and review the degree to which cultural beliefs determine the practices employed to meet the needs of Maori learners, and this is particularly relevant given a largely Pakeha teaching community. Concepts such as this need to be used in a wider context, to include boards of trustees, who make crucial policy decisions at governance level impacting on student learning. While resources such as the abovementioned may be available to boards, and while genuine attempts have been made by some to promote partnership, Graham (2002:96) suggests 'the lack of structural change at the Ministerial level of the state and the unequal power relations at the policy decision-making level' remain major barriers to partnership, and

impedimenta for Maori trustees in their day-to-day governance interactions with the board and with their whanau. While structural change is needed, attitudinal change in dominant Pakeha society may well be harder to effect. Johnston (1997) contends that Maori have suffered from the pious assumption made by the architects of the education reforms that Maori language and culture would be seen as intrinsically valuable by all New Zealanders, and that this ignored ingrained colonialist beliefs in the inferiority of Maori language and culture and the belief by Pakeha in the supremacy of their own language and culture (1997:89). While the dominant 'world view' beliefs, values and practices are seen as the norm, Pakeha see culturally different beliefs, values and practices as 'different' in ways that devalue them (Foucault, 1980, cited in Court, 2003:172). This thinking can be seen today, sixteen years on from the reforms, 'where Pakeha remain the dominant partner and Maori needs and interests are reduced as cultural additives to education policies and practices' (Graham, 2002:174). Fraser (1997) and Court (2003) argue that there needs to be a recognition and equal valuing of cultural and philosophical differences between Maori and Pakeha to bring about improved cultural justice, and that to attain this an acknowledgement and addressing of injustices and material inequalities that are grounded in the political-economic structure of society needs to occur (2003:173).

In seeking redress for the inadequacies of the governance structure for Maori, Court (2003) poses some questions around partnership which have been previously unexplored by those who make policy impacting on power relations between Maori and Pakeha. These questions are as relevant to individual boards in localised governance situations as they are to the state. She suggests that partnerships could be enhanced by an exploration and valuing of the views, beliefs and practices of different ethnicities within the community, and for debate to centre around how schools could build a more fully democratic participation by the community (Court, 2003: 181). For this to happen, Furman (1998) suggests that dialogue needs to be informed by a 'decentering of whiteness', to enable school members to understand how difference is constructed within 'webs of domination, subordination, hierarchy and exploitation' (Giroux, 1992: 75, cited in Furman, 1988:319). Only then can our present society become enlightened enough to move away from the persuasive 'drive towards sameness' (Noddings, 1996, cited in Court, 2003), which denounces any celebration

of diversity, leading to such current political mantra as Don Brash's championing of 'one standard of law for all'. These questions are relevant for both the state and individual boards and communities to consider. It remains to be seen whether education policy makers would be open to debating how to 'best support the development of dialogic schools committed to ethical forms of accountability and social justice' (Court, 2003:181), given that it may lead to a defoliation of state control. But for the government not to consider these issues, is to ignore the many problems faced by the Maori trustees in this study, and those others who will follow them into school governance. Further, if structural inequalities are not addressed at policy level, Maori student achievement, the espoused aim of the education reforms in relation to Maori, will never be raised to the level anticipated.

## CHAPTER SIX: REFERENCES

- Anderson, G. & Arsenault, N. (1998). *Fundamentals of Educational Research*. London: Falmer press.
- Aspinwall, K., Simkins, T., Wilkinson, J., and McAuley, J. (1994). Using Success Criteria. In *Improving Educational Management Through Research and Consultancy*. London. Paul Chapman.
- Ball, S.J. (1994). *Cost, Culture and Control: Self Management and Entrepreneurial Schooling*. London: Routledge.
- Bevan-Brown, J. (2003). The Cultural Self-Review: Providing Culturally Effective, Inclusive, Education for Maori learners. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Bishop, R. (1996). *Collaborative Research Stories Whakawhanaungatanga*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Bishop, R. & Berryman, M. (2002). *The Experiences of Indigenous Maori Students in New Zealand Classrooms: Research in Progress*. University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- Bishop, R. & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture Counts: Changing Power Relations in Education*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Bishop, R. & Graham, S. (1997). *Implementing Treaty of Waitangi Charter Goals in Tertiary Institutions: A Case Study*. Wellington. Syndicate of Educational Development Centres of New Zealand Amenities.
- Blaikie, N. (1993). *Approaches to Social Enquiry*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bogden, R. & Bilken, S. (1992). *Qualitative Research for Education*. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.
- Boston, J. (1991). The Theoretical Underpinnings of Public Sector Restructuring. In Boston, J., Martin, J., Pallot, J. and Walsh, P. (eds). *Reshaping the State: New Zealand's Bureaucratic Revolution*. Oxford University Press, (pp.1-26). Auckland.
- Bush, T. (2002). Authenticity – Reliability, Validity, and Triangulation. In Colemann, R. and Briggs, A. (eds.), *Research Methods in Educational Leadership and Management*. London: Sage Publications.
- Butterworth, G. & Butterworth, S. (1998). *Reforming education- the New Zealand experience 1984-1996*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Clark, J. (1997). *Educational Research: Philosophy, Politics, Ethics*. Palmerston North: ERDC Press.

- Codd, J. (1990).** Educational Policy and the State. In Middleton, S., Codd, J., & Jones, A. *New Zealand Education Policy Today*. (pp.191-205). Wellington: Allen and Unwin.
- Codd, J. (1993).** 'Managerialism, Market Liberalism and the Move to Self-Managing Schools in New Zealand', Chapter 9 in Smith, J. (ed) *A Socially Critical View of the Self-Managing School*. (pp.153-170). London: Falmer Press.
- Codd, J. (1998).** *Educational Reform and the Culture of Distrust*. A paper presented to Annual Conference of the New Zealand Association for Research in Education, Dunedin. Massey University. Palmerston North.
- Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1994).** *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge.
- Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1997).** *Research Methods in Education*. Fourth Edition. London: Falmer Press.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990).** *Stones of experience and narrative inquiry*. In *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 19, No. 5, (pp.2-14).
- Court, M. (2003).** Towards democratic leadership. Co-principal initiatives. In *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, April-June, Vol. 6, No. 2, (pp.161-183).
- Court, M. (2005).** Crossing cultural boundaries or caught in political crossfire? In *New Zealand Journal of Educational Leadership*. Vol. 20, Issue 1, (pp. 47-64).
- Dannermarck, B., Ekstrom, M., Jakobsen, L., & Karlsson, J.C. (2002).** *Explaining Society: Critical Realism in the Social Sciences*. London: Routledge.
- Denscombe, M. (2003).** *The Good Research Guide: For Small Scale Research Projects*. (Second Edition). Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Department of Education, (1987).** *The Curriculum Review*. A report to the committee to review the curriculum for schools. Government Printer. Wellington.
- Doherty, Joe. (1994).** Equal Employment Opportunity-The Maori Perspective. In *The Vision and the Reality: EEO in the New Zealand Workplace*. (Sayers and Tremaine). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Durie, A. (2002).** *Whakamua Whakauri: Maori Research*. Keynote address presented at the 2002 NZARE Research Conference. Massey University. Palmerston North.
- Durie, M. (2001).** *A Framework for Considering Maori Educational Advancement*. An address to the Ministry of Education, 9 August, Wellington.

- Eade, D. (1997).** *Capacity Building: An Approach to People Centred Development*. Oxfam (UK & Ireland) Atlantic highland, Oxford: N.J. Humanities Press International.
- Education Review Office (1994).** *Good New Zealand Schools*. A National Education Report. (Number 4). Education Review Office. Wellington.
- Education Review Office (1999a).** *School Governance and School Achievement*. Education Review Office. Wellington.
- Else, A., (1997).** *Maori Participation and Performance in Education*. A Literature Review and Research Programme. A summary of Chapple. S., Jeffries, R. & Walker, R. Ministry of Education. Wellington.
- Focault, M. (1980).** *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Fontana, A. & Frey, J. (1994).** *Interviewing*. In Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Fitzsimons, P., Peters, M. & Roberts, P. (1999).** In Thrupp, M. (Ed.), *A Decade of Reform in New Zealand Education – Where to Now?* University of Waikato, School of Education.
- Fraser, N. (1997).** Justice interruptus: Critical reflections on the postsocialist condition (New York: Routledge). In *International Journal of leadership in Education*, April-June, 2003, Vol. 6, No. 2, (pp.161-183).
- Gordon, L. (1994).** Is School Choice a Sustainable Policy for New Zealand?: A Review of Recent Research Findings and a Look to the Future', *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, Vol. 4, 1999, (pp. 9-24).
- Griffith, M. (1998).** *Education Research for Social Justice*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Graham, James Philip Hector. (2002).** *Partnership Relationships between Schools and Maori Communities*. A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education, Massey University, Palmerston North.
- Harold, B. (1995).** *Negotiation and Contestation During Times of Change -The Introduction of New Educational Policies to three Rural Schools*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Waikato, Hamilton.
- Janesick, V. J. (1994).** *The Dance of Qualitative Research Design*. In Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Johnston, P.M.G. (1991).** *A Fair Measure of Influence? – Maori Members on School Boards of Trustees*. A thesis presented to the University of Auckland in fulfilment of

the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Education, University of Auckland.

**Johnston, P.M.G. (1993).** *Examining a State Relationship*. Legitimation and Te Kohanga Reo. The return of the prodigal child? A paper presented to the NZARE conference, Waikato University.

**Johnston, P.M.G. (1997).** Tiptoeing Through the Puha. In *Education Policy in New Zealand: the 1990s and beyond*. Olssen, M. & Morris Matthews, K. (pp. 83-106). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

**Johnston, P. M. G. (1998).** *He Ao Rereke, Education policy and Maori Underachievement: Mechanisms of Difference*. PhD Thesis in Education, University of Auckland.

**Johnston, P. M. G. (1999).** In Through the Out Door: Policy Developments and Processes for Maori. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 30, No.1, (pp.77-85).

**Kenrick, P. M. M. J. (2002).** *He tirohanga mo te oritetanga: Analysis of the gaps*. A project presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education at Massey University, Palmerston North.

**Kilmister, T. (1990).** *The Effective School Board: Policy Governance in Action*. Wellington: NFP Press.

**Kiro, C. (2000).** Maori Research and the Social Services. Te Puawaitanga o te Tohu. In *Social Work review*. Vol. 12, No. 4, Sum 2000.

**Lange, D. (1988).** *Tomorrow's Schools (1988): The Reform of Education Administration in New Zealand*. Wellington: Government Printer.

**Lather, P. (1991).** *Getting Smart: Feminist Research and Pedagogy within the Postmodern*. London: Routledge.

**Lather, P. (1995).** The Validity of Angels: Interpretive and Textual Strategies in Researching the Lives of Women with HIV/AIDS. In *Qualitative Inquiry*, March 1997 Vol. 3, No.1, (pp.41-68). London: Sage Publications.

**Leadership and Management Facilitation Team. (2004).** *No More Nagging Doubts: Making Sense of, and Managing the National Education Guidelines*. Kohia Teachers Centre Publication. University of Auckland.

**Lincoln, Y. S. (1993).** I and thou: Method, voice, and roles in research with the silenced. In D. McLaughlin & W. G. Tierney (Eds.), *Naming silenced lives* (pp.29-50). New York: Routledge.

**Manning, Kathleen. (1997).** Authenticity in Constructivist Inquiry: Methodological Considerations Without Prescription. (Methods for research by social scientists) *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol.3, No.1. (p.93). London: Sage Publications.

- McKinley, Sheridan, (2000).** *Maori Parents and Education*. Wellington. New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- McLeod, J. (2002).** *Better Relationships for Better Learning: Schools Addressing Maori Achievement Through Partnership*. Research thesis submitted as partial fulfilment of a Masters Degree in Education. Massey University. Palmerston North.
- McMillan, J. & Schumacher, S. (1993).** *Research in Education*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Merriam, S.B. (1998).** *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*. California: Jossey Bass.
- Middleton, S., Codd, J., & Jones, A. (Eds.). (1990).** *New Zealand Education Policy Today: Critical perspectives*. Wellington: Allen and Unwin.
- Middleton, S. & Jones, A. (1997).** *Women and Education in Aotearoa*. (second edition). Auckland University Press.
- Miles, M., & Huberman, A. (1994).** *Qualitative Data Analysis*. California. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Ministry of Education (2003).** *The complexity of community and family influences on children's achievement in New Zealand: Best Evidence Synthesis*, Adrienne Alton-Lee, Fred Biddulph et al, Wellington.
- Ministry of Education (2000).** *Better Relationships for Better Learning: Guidelines for boards of trustees and schools on engaging with Maori parents, whanau, and communities*. Learning Media Ltd. Wellington.
- New Zealand Government. (1989).** *Education Act 1989*.
- Rae, K. (1999).** *Reforming education – was this indeed the New Zealand experience?* New Zealand Education Review.
- Olssen, M. & Morris Matthews, K. (1997).** *Education Policy in New Zealand: The 1990s and Beyond*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Ramsey, P., Hawk, K., Harold, B., Marriot, R., Poskitt, J. (1993).** *Developing Partnerships: Collaboration Between Teachers and Parents*. Learning Media Ltd. Wellington.
- Rigney, L. (1999).** Internationalization of an Indigenous Anticolonial Cultural Critique of Research Methodologies: A Guide to Indigenist Research Methodology and its Principles. *Wicazo SA Journal of Native American Studies Review*, Vol. 14, No. 2, (pp.109-121).



- Royal Commission on Social Policy (1988).** *The Treaty of Waitangi Directions for Social Policy*. Royal Commission on Social Policy: (pp.25-88). April Report. Wellington.
- Scheurich, J. (1995).** A Postmodernist Critique of Research Interviewing. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, Vol. 8, (pp.239-252).
- Scott, D., & Usher, R. (1999).** *Researching Education: Data, Methods and Theory in Educational Enquiry*. London: Continuum.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1996).** *Leadership for the Schoolhouse*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Silverman, D. (1997).** Towards an Aesthetics of Research. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice* (pp. 239-253). London: Sage Publications.
- Simon, J. (1986)** *Ideology and the Schooling of Maori Children*. Dept of Education, Massey University, Palmerston North.
- Simon, J. (1990).** *The Place of Schooling in Maori Pakeha Relations*. PhD thesis in Anthropology, University of Auckland.
- Simon, J., & Smith, L.T. (Eds). (2001).** *A Civilising Mission? Perceptions and Representations of the Native Schools System*. Auckland University Press.
- Smelt, S. (1998).** *Today's Schools – Governance and Quality*. Institute of Policy Studies. Wellington.
- Smith, G.H. (1988).** *Pikau: A Burden for One's Back*. Access 7.
- Smith, G., & Smith, L. (1996).** *New Methodologies in Maori Education*, in Spoonley, P., Machpherson, C., and Pearson, D. (1996:229). (Ed). *Nga Patai: Racism and Ethnic Relations in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. (1999).** *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- Snook, I. (1997).** Democracy, Education and the New Right. In Olssen, M. & Morris Matthews, K. (Eds.), *Education policy in New Zealand: the 1990s and beyond*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Spoonley, P. (1999).** *The Challenge of Cross-cultural Research*. In Davidson, C. & Tolich M., (Eds.), *Social Science in New Zealand: Many Paths to Understanding* (pp.51-61). Auckland: Longman.
- Stake, R. E. (1995).** *The Art of Case Study Research*. California: Sage Publications.
- Stokes, Kanewa. (2003).** *The Tensions Facing a Board of Trustee Model Within the Cultural Framework of Kura Kaupapa Maori*. A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment

of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts in Social Policy, Massey University, Albany.

**Strachan, J. (1997).** *Feminist Educational Leadership*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Waikato.

**Stringer, E. (1999).** *Action Research*. California. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

**Taskforce to Review Education Administration. (1988).** *Administering for Excellence: Report of the Taskforce to Review Education Administration*. Government Print. Wellington.

**Te Puni Kokiri (2001).** *The Quality of Teacher Training for Teaching Maori Students. State Sector Performance*. Ministry of Maori Development. Wellington.

**Tolich, M. & Davidson, C. (1999).** *Starting Fieldwork*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

**Tremaine, M. (1994).** Different Ways of Making a Difference: EEO Maori and Tino Rangatiratanga in Public Sector Organisations. In *The Vision and the Reality: EEO in the New Zealand workplace*. (Sayers and Tremaine). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

**Vincent, C. (2000).** *Including Parents? Education, Citizenship and Parental Agency*. Open University. Philadelphia, Pa.

**Wagemaker, H. (1992).** What Makes Good Research? *Research and Statistics Division Bulletin*, Vol. 5, (pp.37-43).

**Woodward, K. (Ed). (1997).** *Identity and Difference*. London: Sage, in association with the Open University.

**Wylie, C. (1995).** Contrary Currents: The Application of the Public Sector Reform Framework in Education. In *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, Vol. 30, No. 2, (pp.149-164).

**Wylie, C. (1999).** *Ten Years On: How Schools View Educational Reform*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

**Yin, R. K. (1994).** *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. California: Sage Publications.





**Massey University**

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION  
Te Kupenga o Te Mātauranga

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND  
POLICY STUDIES IN EDUCATION  
Private Bag 11 222  
Palmerston North  
New Zealand  
T 64 6 356 9099  
F 64 6 351 3385  
[www.massey.ac.nz](http://www.massey.ac.nz)

## Appendix A

### Research Project

Maori in School Governance: The voices of Maori trustees

Researcher: Martin Turner

### Evidence of Consultation

Consultation has taken place as outlined in the Ethics Proposal attached.

As researcher I am not fully competent in Te Reo Maori, but I do have an affinity for things Maori. I have a working knowledge and application of ceremonial Te Reo Maori, a growing knowledge of Maori protocols and the sensitivities which surround communicating with Maori. Cultural advice is already being sought from kaumatua with TEAM Solutions.

In addition to this, I plan to meet together with the two Kaumatua and the Dean of Te Puna Wananga, at the Faculty of Education, University of Auckland. The aim of this hui will be to gain cultural affirmation of the project and to take further advice on cultural issues, such as are appropriate to differing iwi and hapu.

If any cultural issues do arise during the research, I will be able to consult those mentioned above. I will also seek insights and perspectives from the group based on their views and experiences of self-managing schools. In doing this I will be able to reconcile these valuable anecdotal perspectives with the knowledge gained through the literature review.

Martin Turner  
(Researcher)





# Massey University

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Te Kupenga o Te Mātauranga

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND  
POLICY STUDIES IN EDUCATION

Private Bag 11 222

Palmerston North

New Zealand

T 64 6 356 9099

F 64 6 351 3385

[www.massey.ac.nz](http://www.massey.ac.nz)

## Appendix B

Desiree Patterson  
Central Resourcing  
Ministry of Education  
Private Bag 1666  
Wellington

15 July 2005

Request for Information:

Dear Desiree

My name is Martin Turner. I am a student enrolled as a Masters of Education Administration degree at Massey University. I am also currently employed as a manager by TEAM Solutions, at the Faculty of Education, University of Auckland.

I am required to complete a research project for my degree and for my study. I want to focus on Maori school trustees' perceptions, beliefs and experiences about being a school trustee. There is very little research of this nature available and I would like to research the 'voices' of Maori trustees where school governance is concerned. I hope that this will be useful for Maori people in education, particularly those who are in a trustee role or who are contemplating such a role. I hope that my study will also be of value to those who are working to support boards of trustees and Pakeha board members who wish to understand Maori perspectives on school governance.

I would like to request from the MoE, a list of names of Maori trustees on the Boards of Trustees of all State and Integrated schools in the Auckland and Northland area (Ministry Region One)

I will use this information to approach trustees in writing to gauge interest in being interviewed by myself for the purposes of the research. I need a list of potential trustees so that I can select from various school situations e.g. Urban examples deciles 1-10, rural, remote, Integrated, Intermediate.

The final research project will be presented for assessment as part of my Masters of Education Administration degree.

Should you have any questions regarding this project, please contact me by phone at 09 623 8978 or by email at [m.turner@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:m.turner@auckland.ac.nz) or contact my research supervisor Dr Marian Court. She can be contacted at:

Dr M Court  
Department of Social and Policy Studies in Education  
Massey University  
PN900  
Private Bag 11222  
Palmerston North  
New Zealand  
Voicemail: 00 64 6 351 3462  
Fax: 00 64 6 351 3385  
Email: [M.R.Court@massey.ac.nz](mailto:M.R.Court@massey.ac.nz)

Sincerely,

Martin Turner  
TEAM Solutions  
Faculty of Education  
University of Auckland  
Private Bag 92601  
Symonds St  
AUCKLAND



**Massey University**

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Te Kupenga o Te Mātauranga

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND  
POLICY STUDIES IN EDUCATION

Private Bag 11 222

Palmerston North

New Zealand

T 64 6 356 9099

F 64 6 351 3385

[www.massey.ac.nz](http://www.massey.ac.nz)

## Appendix C

Maori in School Governance: The voices of Maori trustees

### PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

**This consent form will be held for a period of five (5) years**

I have read the Information Sheet and have had the details of the study explained to me. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

I agree/do not agree to the interview being audio taped.

I wish/do not wish to have my tapes returned to me.

I wish/do not wish to have data placed in an official archive.

I agree to not disclose anything discussed in the interview

I agree to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the Information Sheet.

**Signature:**

.....

**Date:**

.....

**Full Name - printed**

.....





# Massey University

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Te Kupenga o Te Mātauranga

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND  
POLICY STUDIES IN EDUCATION

Private Bag 11 222

Palmerston North

New Zealand

T 64 6 356 9099

F 64 6 351 3385

[www.massey.ac.nz](http://www.massey.ac.nz)

## Appendix D

### Maori in School Governance: The voices of Maori trustees

#### INFORMATION SHEET

Kia ora!

My name is Martin Turner. I am a student enrolled as a Masters of Education Administration degree at Massey University. I am also currently employed as a manager by TEAM Solutions, at the Faculty of Education, University of Auckland.

I am required to complete a research project for my degree and for my study. I want to focus on Maori school trustees' perceptions, beliefs and experiences about being a school trustee. There is very little research of this nature available and I would like to research the 'voices' of Maori trustees where school governance is concerned. I hope that this will be useful for Maori people in education, particularly those who are in a trustee role or who are contemplating such a role. I hope that my study will also be of value to those who are working to support boards of trustees and Pakeha board members who wish to understand Maori perspectives on school governance.

I have asked the local Ministry of Education office to help me identify Maori trustees on school boards, so that I can invite trustees from a range of state schools to participate in this research. Your name was included in the list of trustees in the Auckland and Northland area which has been given to me and I am inviting you to take part through an interview with me that will take about one hour of your time. The interview questions will focus on your experiences as a Maori trustee, including the following topics:

- How you came to be a trustee
- What your understandings of your role as a trustee are
- What your understandings of your role in terms of the Treaty of Waitangi are
- What expectations other trustees place on you as a Maori trustee
- What expectations whanau have of you as a Maori trustee
- What successes you have found in the role
- What the tensions and difficulties are in the role
- Your thoughts on how Maori trustees might be used to enhance school governance in the future

Massey University requires all researchers to abide by ethical procedures to protect research participants from harm. Therefore, if you agree to take part in my study, you can be assured of having the following rights.

You are under no obligation to accept this invitation. If you decide to participate you have the right to decline to answer any particular question, withdraw from the study at any time, and ask questions about the study at any time during participation. If you are willing to be interviewed as part of this research a consent form will need to be signed. The consent form is attached as a separate document.

All of your interview responses will be confidential to myself as the researcher. Your identity and the school at which you are a trustee will not be disclosed. To protect your anonymity I suggest that the interview take place away from school at a venue to be negotiated between you and myself as the researcher.

If you agree, I would like to audio-tape the interview. You have the right to ask for the audiotape to be turned off at any time during the interview. I will then transcribe it and send you a copy of this written record of what was said so that you can read it and make any changes you wish. This is to make sure that you are comfortable with me using your material for my research analysis. All my copies of transcripts will be stored securely in a locked cupboard so that nobody else will have access to them. At the completion of the research project, you will also be given a copy of a summary of the research report.

The final research project will be presented for assessment as part of my Masters of Education Administration degree.

Should you have any questions regarding this project, please contact me by phone at 09 623 8978 or by email at [m.turner@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:m.turner@auckland.ac.nz) or contact my research supervisor Dr Marian Court. She can be contacted at:

Dr M Court  
Department of Social and Policy Studies in Education  
Massey University  
PN900  
Private Bag 11222  
Palmerston North  
New Zealand  
Voicemail: 00 64 6 351 3462  
Fax: 00 64 6 351 3385  
Email: [M.R.Court@massey.ac.nz](mailto:M.R.Court@massey.ac.nz)

I will shortly make contact with you by phone to confirm your willingness to take part. I am available to meet with you if you would like any further clarification.

Naku noa

Martin Turner  
TEAM Solutions  
Faculty of Education  
University of Auckland  
Private Bag 92601  
Symonds St  
AUCKLAND

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee, Wellington Application 05/43. If you have any concerns about the ethics of this research, please contact Professor Sylvia Rumball, Chair, Massey University Campus Human Ethics Committee: WGTN telephone 06 350 5249, email [humanethicswn@massey.ac.nz](mailto:humanethicswn@massey.ac.nz).



**Massey University**

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION  
Te Kupenga o Te Mātauranga

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND  
POLICY STUDIES IN EDUCATION  
Private Bag 11 222  
Palmerston North  
New Zealand  
T 64 6 356 9099  
F 64 6 351 3385  
[www.massey.ac.nz](http://www.massey.ac.nz)

## Appendix E

### Research Project

Maori in School Governance: The voices of Maori trustees

Researcher: Martin Turner

### Interview Schedule

The type of interview will be a semi-structured interview format where I will be able to be flexible in terms of the order in which topics are considered. More significantly this will allow the participant (interviewee) to explore ideas and speak more widely on the issues raised by myself as researcher.

The exact interview questions to ask the participants have not yet been fully developed by myself as researcher. Therefore, the following is an indication of the nature of the questions in a bullet-pointed format:

- How did you come to be a trustee?
- What are your understandings of your role as a trustee?
- What are your understandings of your role in terms of the board's obligations to the Treaty of Waitangi?
- What expectations do other trustees place on you as a Maori trustee?
- What expectations do whanau have of you as a Maori trustee?
- What successes you have found in the role?
- What are the tensions and difficulties you face in the role?
- How might Maori trustees be used to enhance school governance in the future?

These questions and themes will be teased apart by myself as the researcher, to include other related subsidiary questions designed to illicit rich responses from participants.



**Massey University**

**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION**

**Te Kupenga o Te Mātauranga**

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND  
POLICY STUDIES IN EDUCATION

Private Bag 11 222

Palmerston North

New Zealand

T 64 6 356 9099

F 64 6 351 3385

[www.massey.ac.nz](http://www.massey.ac.nz)

## **Appendix F**

**Maori in School Governance: The voices of Maori trustees**

### **AUTHORITY FOR THE RELEASE OF TAPE TRANSCRIPTS**

**This form will be held for a period of five (5) years**

I confirm that I have had the opportunity to read and amend the transcript of the interview/s conducted with me.

I agree that the edited transcript and extracts from this may be used by the researcher, Martin Turner, in reports and publications arising from the research.

**Signature:**

.....

**Date:**

.....

**Full Name - printed**

.....

# Maori in governance: The voices of Maori trustees

Turner, Martin

2006

---

<http://hdl.handle.net/10179/954>

22/04/2023 - Downloaded from MASSEY RESEARCH ONLINE